

The Classical Review

JULY 1898.

It is with much regret that I find myself obliged to retire from the Editorship of the CLASSICAL REVIEW, for which I have no longer sufficient time at my disposal. I am glad, however, to be able to announce that my place will be taken in October by DR. POSTGATE, and also that MR. A. BERNARD COOK, of Trinity College, Cambridge, will be added to the Staff as an Assistant in the Editorial work. I cannot let this announcement go forth without adding an expression of deep gratitude, not only to my Colleagues on the Staff, but also to those many distinguished scholars, both of this country and of America, who, during the past five years, have contributed their writings, and in several cases have aided me by their counsel on matters of difficulty.

G. E. MARINDIN.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from p. 195).

XI. THE CYNEGETICUS.

WE come lastly to the *Cynegeticus*. Two parts of it are so peculiar that great doubt has been felt as to their genuineness, and this doubt has sometimes extended to the body of the work. The latter is a very plain, business-like, technical account of hunting, chiefly hare-hunting, full of matter-of-fact details about hares, dogs, nets, and all the incidents and methods of the sport. But to this is prefixed a curiously high-flown introduction about the legendary heroes of Greece who were taught 'hunting and other noble things' by the centaur Chiron. Each of these heroes is briefly commemorated in a very artificial and florid style. The sudden drop from this ornate proemium to practical hints on the con-

struction of nets is somewhat grotesque. When the practical details have been given, the writer goes on to remark upon the excellent training, bodily and mental, which young men get from their hunting, contrasts it with other and inferior ways of spending time, and passes into a vehement attack upon the sophists and such men as in politics or private life seek their own advancement by unfair means. This is so unnecessary an appendage to a book on hunting, that it has not unnaturally been regarded with great suspicion.

It will conduce to clearness if we take the three parts separately. I will begin with chapters i.-xi., the body of the work, and examine the language of it, trying to ascertain first what things it contains, if any, that are at all characteristic of X., or that,

being noticeable, are at least not inconsistent with his style: and secondly what there is, if anything, that points the other way.

In dealing with the *Cynegeticus* I have derived some help from Brennecke's dissertation *de authentia et integritate Cynegetici Xenophontei* (Posen 1868) and from Vol. 3, Part 2 (London 1897) of Mr. Dakyns' *Works of Xenophon*, containing his translation of the treatise with notes and other remarks.

We have seen more than once that X. is fonder of ἔχειρεν (2. 2) than most Attic writers, who prefer ἐπίχειρεν. Μή with third person aorist imperative, (2. 2 μηδεῖσ-νομισάτω) is not at all common in prose, but X. has it sometimes: Kühner § 397. 3 quotes *Cyr.* 7. 5. 73 : 8. 7. 26. In 2. 5 τῶν βρόχων τὸ διάστρημα (*i.e.* in the δάκτυν) τον ταῖς ἄρκυσιν is an elliptical form of expression, and the same is probably the analysis of 9. 10 τὸ τέ τάχος οὐδενὶ εἰκός ἔστι τῶν τηλικούτων νεβρῶν, where I take οὐδενὶ to be short for 'the speed of any animal,' οὐδενὸς τάχει. This ellipse is found in X.: cf. *Oec.* 7. 32 ἡ ὥγεμων ἔξομοιοτάτη τοῖς ἔργοις οἵς ἐμὲ δεῖ πράττειν: *Hiero* 1. 38 ἔξεκάζουσιν αὐτὸν ταῖς τῶν φυλούτων ἐπονγύαις: *Cyr.* 5. 1. 4 ὅμιοιαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἑσθῆτα δημαλής (2. 7) = ὅμαλός is accepted by Hug in *An.* 4. 6. 12, ὅτι and διότι in successive sentences (3. 1), both meaning 'because,' are found *Symp.* 8. 19. We observed on the *Apologia S.* that X., unlike most prose writers, but like the tragedians, prefers ὄμμα to ὀφθαλμός. Here ὄμμα is used some nine or ten times (3. 3: 4. 1. 3, 4 etc.) and ὀφθαλμός I think only once (5. 11). The usually poetical ἄλγος (3. 3) occurs *Symp.* 8. 37: λύπη is the common prose word. The place of μέν, δέ, οὖν, which we notice several times in this and other chapters (3. 3 αἱ ὑψηλαὶ μέν..., αἱ ἀψηλοὶ δέ κ.τ.λ.: 3. 4 τὰ ὁτα μέν) is quite Xn.: cf. Kühner § 528. 1. Εἰοὶ δ' αἱ (3. 6. and 10), ἔστι δὲ οἵς (11. 4), ἔστιν δέ (5. 16) agree with X.'s preference of these forms to ἔνοι (5. 18 MSS. ἔνοι, edd. ἔνοιν: but see note below) and ἔνιοτε (9. 19). So too I make the book to contain eight instances of πρόσθεν (3. 6 etc.) against five of ἔμπροσθεν (4. 1 etc.); and this again, as we have several times seen, is characteristic of X. Θαυμά (3. 7) = πολλάκις occurs four or five times in X., hardly elsewhere in prose (neither Plato nor Aristotle). Ἡγέμεναι (3. 11) is an uncommon use of ἤγειν, bring up, educate, to be illustrated by ἀχθέσθαι, also of dogs, in *Mem.* 4. 1. 3. Πολὺ μείζω (4. 1 and 5. 30) agrees with X.'s preference of πολύ to πολλῷ with comparatives, but we find πολλῷ μείζῳ

in 10. 12. The usually poetical ποδώκης (4. 2: 5. 17: 9. 1: ποδώκεια 5. 27) occurs in *Mem.* 3. 11. 8 and *De R. Eq.* 3. 12: perhaps it should be regarded as more or less technical. Πυκνά (4. 3, 5: 5. 11), like θαυμά, occurs a few times in X.: in 6. 22 we have the rare πυκνῶς. For the double comparative (4. 4) θάττον φαινόσαι μᾶλλον cf. *Mem.* 3. 13. 5 χαριέστερον...μᾶλλον with Kühner's note. The Xn. use of σύν for μετά appears in 4. 5 σὺν πολλῇ κλάγγῃ: 9. 6 σὺν πόνῳ διωκόμενος: less decidedly in 6. 16 σὺν ταῖς σύραις τὰ σώματα ὅλα συνεπικραδαίνουσαι, tails and all. For the importance of this we must bear in mind such facts as Tycho Mommsen points out, e.g. that in all Lysias there are only two examples of σύν, and in all Isocrates no certain example at all. But μετά is also used here (4. 5, 6: 9. 8: 11. 3), as it is by X. Πάντη (4. 5) is rare in most prose (e.g. never in Thucydides, Demosthenes, Lysias), but occurs now and then in X., more often I think in Plato and Aristotle, though in them it usually refers to manner, not to place. X. is rather noticeably fond of an accusative joined to verbs of motion to express the ground traversed. Thus *De R. Eq.* 8. 1 τρέχειν δεῖσθαι...καὶ πρανῆ καὶ σρόθια καὶ πλάγια: *Hipparch.* 3. 14 τὰ ὄρδα ταχὺ ἐλαύνειν χρῆ: *An.* 4. 4. 1 πορεύεσθαι πεδίον: *ib.* 2. 4. 27 τὰ δύνσβατα πορεύειν: *Cyr.* 2. 4. 22 ὅτι τὴν ὄρειν ἦν (γῆν or χώραν). This is a construction occasionally, though but rarely, found in poetry, both Greek and Latin (e.g. *Il.* 7. 6: *Prom.* V. 708: *Aj.* 30: *Aen.* 1. 524: *Prop.* 2. 28. 19); in Greek prose I do not know whether it occurs except in X. and the Ionic of Herodotus (e.g. 7. 121 ἵη τὴν περόγύαν: 2. 24. 2 ἔρχεται τῆς Διβίης τὰ ἄνω). But in the *Cynegeticus* we have it three or four times: 4. 6 τὰ ὄρη θεονῶν: 5. 17 θέοντι... τὰ ἀνάντη ἡ τὰ ὄμαλά: 5. 18 ὅταν τὸν λίθον, τὰ ὄρη, τὰ φέλλαια, τὰ δασέα ἀποχωρῶν (cf. particularly *De R. Eq.* 8. 10 φεγγή ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου παντοῖα χωρία): in 4. 9 it seems to be used once, if not twice, and perhaps in 5. 15.

The poetical φέγγος (5. 4: 10, 7), νεογύός (5. 14: 9. 1), νάτη or νάπος (5. 15: 9. 11: 10. 19) are all found in X., the last several times. Τέκνα is used here (5. 24) in the unusual sense of the young of an animal, but we have seen before that X. makes use of the word, although most prose and Aristophanes abstain from it, presumably as poetical. Τὰ ἔργασμα (5. 15) is found in *Cyr.* 1. 4. 16: σμῆς (5. 16: 6. 5) up-hill in *Hell.* 4. 3. 23: κατάδηλος (18 bis) often in X. "Ἐπομα (5. 28 and seven or eight times in Chh. 6 and 10) we have seen

to be a Xn. word by no means in universal use. With ἔρεγνεν ὄρθον in 5. 29 cf. *An.* 4. 6. 12 ῥάον ὄρθον ιέναι η δύμαλές. 'Οψίω, δύμιζομαι (6. 4) is scarcely cited except from *An.* 4. 5. 5 : *Hell.* 6. 5. 21 : and the disputed *Resp. Lac.* 6. 4. 'Αμφί (6. 5) is a preposition all but confined among Attic prose-writers to X., for with the doubtful exception of *Menex.* 242 E Plato uses it only in the phrase οἱ ἀμφί τινα and other writers not at all. 'Αέναος (6. 5) is a poetical word found not only in the disputed *Ages.* 1. 20 and *Vect.* 4. 17 but also in *Cyr.* 4. 2. 44 : *Hell.* 3. 2. 19. Μένος (6. 15 : 10. 16) is still more poetical, but occurs three or four times in X. (*Hell.* 7. 1. 31 etc.), and the mainly poetical κότος (6. 25 : cf. ὑπόκοτος *ibid.*) may be found *de R. Eq.* 4. 2 : *An.* 5. 8. 3. δύμῶν near (6. 6) is very rare in prose, but occurs a few times in X. (*Cyr.* 3. 1. 2 etc.); so too δύμάθεν (7. 8) in *Cyr.* 1. 4. 23 etc. With ἡμελημένην ἐνθῆτα (6. 11), a sort of négligé, cf. *An.* 1. 7. 19 ἐπορεύετο ἡμελημένος; ἀμ' ἥλω ἀνέχοται (6. 13) occurs in the same form or with ἀνέχονται in *An.* 2. 1. 3 and *Hell.* 2. 1. 23. Πολλά = πολλάκις (6. 14, 23 : 8. 3) is rare in prose, but cf. *An.* 4. 3. 2 πολλὰ τῶν παρεληλυθότων πόνων μητροεύσαντες and one or two other places. Μέχρι as a conjunction (6. 21 μέχρι ἂν σαφῶς γνωρίσωτον) occurs a good many times in X. and *Plato*, seldom elsewhere in Attic prose. For κατέχειν in the unusual sense of *in-stare* (6. 22 and the passive in 9. 20) cf. *Cyr.* 1. 4. 22.

A remarkable phenomenon is the appearance six times in the sixth chapter and three times later (6. 7, 8, 12, 23, 25, 26 : 9. 12 : 10. 7, 8) of the final conjunction ὅπως ἀν with a subjunctive. Although ὅπως ἀν, not ἵνα (which hardly occurs) is the regular final conjunction in Attic official inscriptions, it will be seen from the table which Goodwin has put together (*Moods and Tenses* p. 398) out of Weber's statistics that in literature it is infrequent on the whole, occurring with the subjunctive four times in Demosthenes, twelve times altogether in the Ten Orators, never in Thucydides. Weber (*Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze* 2. 74 foll.) cites outside the *Cynegeticus* five passages of X., namely, *Hell.* 1. 6. 9 : 3. 4. 9 : *Cyr.* 5. 2. 21 and 4. 37 : 8. 3. 6 : also four passages where it goes with an optative (*Hell.* *Cyr.* *An.*). It is therefore very noticeable and, though rare in X., may be called Xn. Its extraordinary comparative frequency in these three Chh. is curiously paralleled by the unusual frequency (nine times) with

which it occurs in the *Lysistrata* (Weber i. p. 115) and by the fact of its occurring in only five of the dialogues of Plato (*ib.* 2. 62).

Weber's statistics are useful to us on another point. We find in 7. 10 and 10. 14 the use of μή as a final conjunction = ἵνα μή, ὅπως μή. Weber shows (2. pp. 70 and 92 : cf. note in Goodwin p. 112) that this occurs twelve times in the works ascribed to X. (five times in *Cyr.* three in *An.*, twice in *Mem.*, twice here) and twenty-four times in Plato, but that otherwise it is almost unknown to prose (e.g. twice in Demosthenes). Its occurrence here is therefore certainly important. In 7. 12 the editors have no doubt rightly received the correction ὡς τὰ πολλά for εἰς τὰ πολλά. This phrase, which is found again in 10. 7, is not a common one, but it occurs a few times in X. (e.g. *Cyr.* 2. 1. 30 : 8. 1. 14). Κατασκέψασθαι (9. 2) is an uncommon compound found in X. 'Αντιπέρας (9. 3) is Xn. too. Weber (2. p. 83) gives six examples from X. of a purely final ὅπως with future indicative, one of which is 9. 4 τῶν τόπων ἐνθυμούμενον, ὅπως μή ἀμαρτήσεται. It was probably by an oversight that he failed to add 8. 6 τῆς ὥρας ἐνθυμούμενον, ὅπως . . . ξεται η λειπομένη ικανή περιστήσασθαι (i.e. τὰς ἄρκυς). But in both places the use of ἐνθυμεῖσθαι seems to me to make the ὅπως clause not purely final but rather what Weber calls an 'incomplete final clause,' by which he means the use after σκοτεῖσθαι, ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, etc., Goodwin's 'object clause.'

The τε . . . τε of 9. 10 and 18 (instead of τε καί) is occasionally found in X.: see the table in Roquette's *De X. Vita* p. 39. He says there are six examples altogether in the book: I have not noticed so many. A single connecting τε, which is also just noticeable and not un-Xn. will be found in 10. 23. Νεαρός (9. 10) is mostly poetical, but see *Cyr.* 1. 4. 3. In 9. 10 and 11. 4 we have the plural verb with a neuter plural subject. This is much commoner in X. than in most authors. The rare δυστοπεῖσθαι (9. 16) occurs *Mem.* 2. 1. 4, and the rare ἀλεενός, ψυχενός (10. 6) are both used by X. more than once. Περί (or much more often ἀμφί) τι ἔχειν is a regular Xn. expression for being engaged with something. With περί αὐτὸν ἔχειν (10. 9) cf. for instance *Hell.* 7. 4. 28 περὶ τοὺς Ἡλείους εἶχον. 'Εγκρατής (10. 10) very seldom means strong, but cf. *de R. Eq.* 7. 8 : *Hell.* 7. 1. 23. With ἐκνεύω (10. 12) cf. *de R. Eq.* 5. 4. The poetical ἀμφιβαίνω (10. 13) reminds us of X.'s liking for ἀμφί: see above on 6. 5. Φέρεσθαι (10. 21) is used by him several times of a rapid on-

set. Ἐκπονεῖν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν (10. 21 : cf. the disputed *Agēs*. 11. 9) is an uncommon phrase, but X. like Euripides is distinctly fond of ἐκπονεῖν.

I turn now to look for evidence on the other side: noticeable words, forms, phrases, constructions, not found in X., which can be regarded as grounds for suspicion. There are, according to Brennecke, not less than 360 words in the *Cynegeticus* which are not found elsewhere in X., but of this great number much the larger part may be set aside at once as unimportant. Technical terms are of no value for our inquiry. X. has no occasion elsewhere to use them, and therefore their non-appearance elsewhere has no significance. Semi-technical perhaps are a few words like γεγωνέν (6. 24), σκοπωρεύσθαι (9. 2), συνεπικραδαίνεν (6. 16). The second of these occurs once in Aristophanes (*Wasps* 361 anapaests), and Ar. *Ach.* 965 (mock-heroic) seems the only passage where κραδαίνει is used by a good author in anything like the language of prose. Probably we may also set aside many late imperatival forms, such as προΐτωσαν and ποιείτωσαν (4. 3 and 4), which appear in the MSS. but have been held by editors to be due to copyists and do not now appear in editions. This, however, should not be taken quite for granted. A third class to be noticed is made up of words such as we have often seen to be really characteristic of X., though these particular examples do not elsewhere occur in him. They are words of a more or less poetical cast, otherwise known to us mainly or even entirely from use in the poets. In all the minor works which we have examined we have found such words, sometimes occurring only once in the Xn. *corpus*, sometimes more often. Among them we may perhaps class πλάνος (3. 6), λέχριος (4. 3), βρύιος (5. 12), ρεῖθρος (5. 15 and 34: 9. 11), ρέψημα (5. 16: used two or three times elsewhere in X., but not in the sense of stream), νῦμα (5. 34: Plato), θραιῶ (6. 1), ρόνε (6. 5), ἀνάστω (6. 17), πρωτπελάζω (6. 19), ἀμειβομαι (9. 14), ζόμαι (9. 14), though one or two may be uncertain. Such words as γεγωνέν, etc., mentioned above will have to be added, if they are not technical. The simple εὐδῶ (5. 11) is also distinctly poetical, like the simple ζόμαι (*καθεύδω*, *καθίζομαι* being the common prose words), but it follows immediately upon καθεύδω, and there is reason to think the Greeks liked to put the simple after the compound instead of repeating the compound form. All these words, therefore, though not used by X. elsewhere, tell really rather for than against Xn. authorship.

The following words or expressions, not found elsewhere in X. so far as I know, strike me as worth noticing: ἀλλάττειν τὴν ἡλικίαν (2. 1) and the intransitive ἔξαλλάττων diverging (10. 7): ἥσυχη (2. 8) in the rare sense *slightly* or approximating to it: ἵπερλαπτρύνομαι (3. 7: λαπτρύνομαι is not found in X.), τὸ ἀνήκοντον (3. 8), στιφρός (4. 1), ἐπίταν (4. 1) and ἐπὶ τὸ δυνατόν (5. 8), γνωρίζω (4. 4), in the rare sense *make known*, αἰώρεισθαι (4. 4), ἐπανίέναι, stop (4. 5: 7. 1: 10. 11), φθινόπωρον (5. 9: μετόπωρον a few times here and elsewhere), ισόπεδος (5. 18), and ἄπεδος (6. 9: 10. 9), τηρῶ (6. 1), ἐκπειτίεινai (6. 10: 8. 3, 5), ἄγνωστος (6. 15), ἐπιγνωρίζω (6. 23), ἐνδελεχώς (7. 2), περιφοβεῖσθαι (1. 9. 17: πεφοβῆσθαι Dindorf), ρίσττειν neuter (9. 20) and the compounds διαρριπτεῖν, ἐπιρριπτεῖν, ἐπαναρριπτεῖν (whether the contracted form is right is uncertain), καταφερής (10. 9: cf. 5. 30), νεογενής (10. 23).

I take finally a few points of a more grammatical nature. Four times (5. 8, 20: 9. 8, 20) we find ὅτε δέ meaning *at other times* and with no ὅτε μέν preceding. This ὅτε is quoted (Krüger 25. 10. 12) from Thuc. 7. 27. 4: Plat. *Phaedo* 59 A: *Theaet.* 207 D; but these examples, if right, seem to be the only other ones between Iliad 11. 568 (?) and Aristotle (see Bonitz' Index). It is in fact a use characteristic of late Greek, and the absence of anything like ὅτε μέν makes the phrase somewhat more noticeable. Ἔνιον ἐρύθμα is read by both Dindorf and Sauppe in 5. 18, but the MSS. have ἔνιοι and ἔνιον is extremely doubtful (see note below). Ἔνιον in the singular seems not to be known before Aristotle. Ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τίνα τινος, deprive a man of, is an unusual construction (6. 4). In ὅποσαχῇ οὖλον τ' ἀν ὦ (6. 20) the ἀν occupies an unusual position, but besides Pind. *N.* 4. 91: Ar. *R.* 259 there are parallels even in prose, cf. *Laws* 647 Ε ὅποσῳ πλέον ἀν ὅλη (so too 850 Α): 739 C ὅποι τὸ πάλαι λεγόμενον ἀν γίγνηται. Αἱ τίς κα is common in Doric inscriptions (see Cauer's *Delectus passim*, e.g. No. 8, lines 120, 127, 152, and so in the *Laws* 862 D and 890 Α ὅπι τις ἀν, 909 E ὅπη τις ἀν, Demosth. 2. 14 ὅποι τις ἀν. In X. we find *Hiero* 1. 38 ὃ μάλιστ' ἀν δύνωνται, where I needlessly proposed to read ὃ ἀν: *Cyr.* 4. 5. 52 ὅ τι ἄλλο ἀν: *Vect.* (?) 1. 1. ὅποιοι τινες ἀν (cf. Platonic *Epist.* 13. 362 c). Κάρωθεν governing a genitive (8. 8: 4. 1 is, I suppose, different) is found in Aristotle *H. A.* 8. 24. 604 a 28. In 8. 8 σκεψάμενον οὖν δεῖ ὅποι ἀν ὃ περιστασθαι and 9. 18 σκοτούμενον ὅποι ἀν φέρηται it certainly looks as if the clauses with ὅποι and ὅποι were dependent questions, in which case the

subjunctive would be very remarkable : but perhaps it is not absolutely necessary to take them so. There is probably no precise parallel in X. to the use of the participle with ἔχω (10, 11 ἐὰν...ἔπανεις ἔχει) as in tragedy, Herodotus, and occasionally, I think, Plato ; for in the nearest passages quoted (*An.* 1, 3, 14 : 4, 7, 1 : 7, 7, 27 : cf. Goodwin § 47) ἔχω hardly loses its own ordinary meaning, and here moreover the participle is neuter, which is unusual even in tragedy. The middle θηράσθαι of literal hunting is unusual, but cf. *Ar. Eq.* 864. A very well-marked grammatical peculiarity of the book is the incessant use of the infinitive in the rules laid down for the young huntsman. This is not precisely the infinitive for imperative that we sometimes find in Greek, because that infinitive does not take its subject in the accusative as here. It is the infinitive used in laws and proclamations (e.g. *Dem.* 23, 22 : *Ar. Ach.* 172) 'depending on some word (understood) like ἔδοξε or κελεύεται' (Goodwin, § 750). It is said not to occur elsewhere in X., not even in the *Hipparch.* and *de Re Eq.* which are similar in nature to the *Cyn.* and might be expected to contain it : but Aristotle occasionally has something like it (Bonitz' Index, p. 343 a). This peculiarity of the *Cyn.* reminds one in a way of the peculiar imperative use of the future indicative throughout the epicure's rules in *Hor. Sat.* 2, 4. The only other thing which I have noticed in the grammar is the unusual amount of asyndeton, words and occasionally clauses being just put side by side without a particle to connect them. In a few cases (e.g. 7, 4) the text can hardly be right : in others, where there is an enumeration of qualities, the asyndeton is not unnatural, though, especially when only two adjectives are thus coupled together (e.g. 6, 1 ἔστω δὲ τὰ μὲν δέρας μαλακά, πλατά : 6, 8 στοιχίζετω δὲ μακρὰ ὑψηλά), it deserves notice. Twice in 4, 1 we have a curious asyndeton, μεταξὺ μακρῶν βραχέων and μεταξὺ μεγάλων μικρῶν. One or two other things will be noticed presently in the critical notes on separate passages.

The facts of language, however, which tell most against Xn. authorship are of a negative, not of a positive, kind. There is a total absence of certain things which we have seen to be Xn. The particle μήν, of which X. is fond to excess and which he uses sometimes with extraordinary frequency (e.g. in the *de R. Eq.*), does not occur once, nor does καὶ—δέ, to which he is much addicted. The figure called *anaphora*, very frequent in him, is not found either, but perhaps one

may fairly say there is little occasion for it. Final ὡς is never used, though ἵνα occurs often, simple ὅπως once or twice, and ὅπως ἦν, as we have seen, with noticeable frequency in certain chapters ; nor does ὡς ever take the place of ὥστε (which is frequent) with either infinitive or indicative, though X. often makes it do so. There is no ἥστε and no ἤνθα, though there are many places where they might have been used. But with regard to μήν and to final ὡς the following facts should be borne in mind. In what Roquette calls the first part of *Hell.* (Books 1 and 2 as far as ch. 3, 10), which in bulk exceeds *Cyn.* by about a third, μήν never occurs : in *Oec.*, which is twice the length of *Cyn.*, it occurs only four times (Roquette, p. 39). As for final ὡς, though it is conspicuous in *An.* and *Cyn.* and in proportion to their length in *Hipparch.* and *de R. Eq.*, it is found according to Roquette only twice in *Oec.*, six times in the whole of *Hell.*, and only once in *Mem.* As to the other words mentioned, I am not aware of any statistics that give their distribution. But perhaps these figures are enough to show that, though the occurrence of a word may be taken as in some degree a mark of Xn. authorship, the fact of its not occurring cannot at present be used as telling much, if at all, on the other side. I say 'at present' because if further inquiry should ever establish clearly the chronology of the works of X., the case might then possibly be altered. Even as it is, the absence of μήν has been taken as a mark that *Cyn.* was early in date, a subject to be touched upon below.

On a careful consideration of all the linguistic evidence for and against, so far as I have been able to marshal it, I come to the conclusion that chapters i.-xi. of the *Cynegeticus* were written by X. This was not my first impression, but further study has brought out a good many things which I then overlooked, and I attach less importance now to the want of a very markedly Xn. diction. There are in point of fact a good many things in the language that point more or less to X., and we must remember that the nature of the subject debarred him from the use of many words and turns of expression that we find in his historical and miscellaneous writings. With one or two exceptions the language is perhaps as Xn. as could be fairly counted upon.

Cobet pronounced the *Cynegeticus*, the whole of which he held to be genuine (*Nov. Lect.* p. 774), to be the earliest of X.'s works, not on the ground of language, but because of the 'youthful fervour' which he considers

it to breathe. If it really was in whole or in part an early work, this might further explain the less distinctly Xn. character of it. But the tone is rather that of an experienced huntsman, no longer young, advising beginners what to do, and the position taken up at starting in 1. 18 (*ἔγω μὲν οὖν παρανῶ τοῖς νέοις κ.τ.λ.*) would be rather ludicrous in a quite young man. Hare-hunting too cannot even in X.'s boyhood have been a common amusement in Attica. The war must have prevented it, and hares must even then have been scarce. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 1203 (422 B.C.), puts the hunting of a boar or a hare and running in the torch-race all together as rather creditable manly performances, nor does he seem to be joking. Nausicles (probably of the Middle Comedy, that is of X.'s time) speaks of Attica as a land *οὗ δασύποδ' εὐρεῖς ἔτοις οὐχὶ βάδον*. This difficulty rises up against the theory which Mr. Dakyns briefly propounds, that the *Cyn.* 'is probably an early work of X.'s rehandled and re-edited, with additions (not improbably) by himself or under his inspiration when an old man.' For this and for other reasons, I think, it seems more natural to connect the book with his residence at Scillus in Elis, of which he himself records in *An.* 5. 3. 8 *ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐν Σκιλλοῦντι χωρίᾳ καὶ θῆραι πάτωται δύστοσος ἔτοιν ἀγρενομενα θηρία, and afterwards θῆραν ἐποιούντο εἰς τὴν ἑόρτην οἵ τε Ξενοφόντος παῖδες καὶ οἱ τῶν ἀλλων πολιτῶν, οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι καὶ ἄνδρες συνεθήρων, and Diogenes 2.52 *τοντεύθεν διετέλει κυνηγεών καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἔτοιῶν καὶ τὰς ιστορίας συγγράφων*, speaking of X. at Scillus. It is then or later that the two books relating to horses and cavalry are generally thought to have been written. The chapters on deer and wild boars are also evidently more suited to other parts of Greece than to Attica. I would add that the whole treatise breathes the spirit of the country, not of a big city. Nothing is said about going out of a town into the country for hunting purposes.*

We now turn to the concluding chapters of the book. It may be right to accept the twelfth and reject the thirteenth, or to draw the line after § 9 of the twelfth; but I will take them together.

Oec. 1. 8 *ἀντὶ τοῦ τρέψεων πεινῆν παρασκενάζει* is the best parallel I can find anywhere for the rather noticeable construction of the simple infinitive in 12. 1 *ὑγίειν τε γὰρ τοῖς σώμασι παρασκενάζει καὶ ὅραν καὶ ἀκούεις μᾶλλον*. *Ἐννή, bed, sleeping-place* is very uncommon in Attic prose, but occurs a few

times in Plato and X., and the use of *εἰνάζεσθαι* in 12. 2 agrees with this. (*Εἴναζω* in 9. 3, like *εἴναι ἵχνη* which occurs frequently in the body of the work, should probably be regarded as technical). 12. 3 gives us *πρόσθεν*: 12. 4 a construction of *παρέχω* with the infinitive (*παρέχει αὐτοῖς πλέον τι εἰδέναι*), like that of *παρασκενάζω* above, which is paralleled in the doubtful *Vect.* 4. 12 (*ἢ πόλις παρέχει... ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς μετάλλοις*; it is, I think, quite uncommon. *Ἐτρέφθην* (12. 5) is as Xn. a form as *ἐτράπην*. *Δυσχωρία* (12. 5) occurs several times in *Cyr.* In 12. 6 *εἰδότες... ὅτι ἐντεῦθεν ητούχον...*, *ἐπιμέλειαν... ἐποιήσαντο* seems an instance of what we have seen before to be much more common in X. than in any one else, the use of the imperfect indicative in *oratio obliqua* instead of the present indicative or optative. *Ἐνόμισαν* in 12. 6 *ἐνόμισαν ὅμως τὸν κυνηγέας μὴ κωλέναι... ἀγρεύειν* means perhaps only 'they had the practice': *νομίζω* in this sense with an infinitive is unusual out of Herodotus, but perhaps occurs in *Hiero* 3. 3 *τὸν μοιχόν νομίζονται πολλαὶ τῶν πόλεων νηποῖν ἀποτελέντειν*. It may, however, have the meaning to which I called attention in a note on *R. L.* 1. 7 of 'laying down a rule.' 'To make a thing a practice' is equally ambiguous in English. In writing on the *R. L.* I overlooked the fact that at least one clear instance of the use is found in *Cyr.* 8. 5. 3 *εὐθὺς δὲ τοῦτο ἐνόμιζε Κύρος, πρὸς ἦν βλέποντας ἰστασθαι τὴν σκηνήν*. Sturz and Holden explain the words in the *Hiero* in the same way, and may very well be right. *Ἀγρεύειν* in 12. 6 is a word found in the poets, but hardly to be found, I think, in good prose except *An.* 5. 3. 8: *Hipparch.* 4. 18: *R. L.* 5. 3. Plato uses *θηρεύειν* frequently, but not *ἀγρεύειν*; nor apparently *θηρῶ*, which is common in X. In 12. 8 we find once at least the simple *τε*, tacking on a clause to what goes before. This occurs again in 13. 11 (*τά τε σώματα*). X.'s characteristic *σύν* presents itself in 12. 11 (*μερά* in 12. 2: 13. 15); *μοχθεῖν*, a distinctly Xn. word, in 12. 15. *Θεοερβῆς* is uncommon, but cf. *θεοερβῶς* *Cyr.* 3. 3. 58 and *θεοσέβεια* *An.* 2. 6. 26. X. repeatedly uses *ἴεσθαι* of rapid movement, *rushing*, etc., but except in him it is practically confined to poetry. Ast gives it as occurring three times in Plato: two of these are purely etymological passages in the *Cratylus*, the third (*Phaedr.* 241 B) is part of a composition described by Plato himself as *διθύραμβοι* (*ib.* 241 E). Its use in a fragment of Pherecrites is uncertain. We may therefore note particularly the occurrence of the word here in 12. 22,

Kωλύω with a genitive (13. 2 ἔτέρων κωλύει χρησίμων) is Xn.: cf. *Hell.* 4. 3. 4: *An.* 1. 6. 2. With μεζόνως (13.3) cf. ἔχθύνως *Symp.* 4. 3. I do not know if X. has παρά, roughly equivalent to ὑπό, after διδάσκειθαι (13. 4), but he certainly has it after ὄμολογεῖσθαι, λέγεσθαι, σημαίνεσθαι, δίδοσθαι, φέλεισθαι. The plural verb παιδεύειν (13. 5), with a neuter plural subject, if right, is not un-Xn. Ἀνεξέλεγκτος (13. 7) occurs *Oec.* 10. 8. Ἐνθύμημα (13. 9 and 13) is found two or three times in X. He makes use of the poetical words εἴκλεια, εἴκλεής, δυσκλείης: here (13. 12) we have δύσκλεια and εἴκλεια. Φιλοκέρδεια (13. 12) is not elsewhere found in him, but he has φιλοκερδής, φιλοκερδέν four or five times. With ἐν ισχῇ ἐστί (13. 14) cf. perhaps ἐν φέλειᾳ εἶναι *Cyr.* 8. 5. 15: *Vect.* 4. 35. When Roquette (*Vita X.* p. 90, note) wrote pluralem maiestaticum praeter *Cyrop.* 1 apud *Xenophontem non nisi in libro de re equestri legiis memini* (π. ιππ. 1. 1. sqq.), he might have added from 13. 13 here βελτίους γίγνονται...δι' ὃν διδάξομεν ἐὰν γάρ κ.τ.λ. The poetical τοκεύς (13. 17) occurs *Mem.* 2. 1. 33. Finally be it remarked that no attention is paid to hiatus in these chapters any more than in the body of the work.

There are therefore various things pointing to X. as the writer, and nothing I should say that points the other way. Ἐνανάνω (12. 9) is unique or very rare in good Greek, but not objectionable. The passive ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι (12. 21) is also very rare. The absolute use of ἐναντίον (*ibid.*) is a little curious, if right. With στοφοβισμένως (13. 5) cf. not only πεπλαγμένως (3. 10) but many other such adverbs in X. (πεφοβημένως, πεφυλαγμένως, etc.: Sauppe's *Lexilogus* p. 19b). Παράγγελμα (13. 9) is not elsewhere used by X. nor the somewhat poetical εὐεπής (13. 16), but the latter is just his kind of word. I do not think he has μάτρων γίγνεσθαι (13. 14), or a plain infinitive after ἐμποδῶν (13. 16 οὐδὲν ἐμποδῶν δοτεῖν), or the phrase λόγοι κατέχει (13. 17 λόγοι κατέχουσι). These are all the points I can see, and they are quite unimportant. But we have to add, as before, the curious absence of the particle μήν.

Certainly the contents of Chapter 13, directed against οἱ σοφισταὶ καλούμενοι, are at once violent and weak, but we do not seem warranted in saying X. cannot have written it. The sentiments are quite natural to him, much more so than to any Ἰσοκρατιδέν, such as Hartman takes the author to have been. Such a person is indeed just the sort of man at whom they

are aimed. Chapter 12 is markedly Xn. in sentiment, at any rate in the earlier part. In *Cyr.* 1. 2. 10: 1. 6. 28 and 39–41 hunting is treated as training and education in just the same way. But the manner in which the point is argued in the later part of this chapter is foolish.

We come finally to the curious and tasteless mythological preface with which the *Cyn.* begins. It is to be observed first that a preface of some kind is needed. We could not begin abruptly with 2. 1 or 1. 18. If therefore the preface is spurious, it has ousted another which was genuine; unless indeed the treatise was never published or finished by its author. Secondly there is a distinct reference back to it in 12. 18 of παρὰ Χείρων ὃν ἐπεμνήσθην. Unless we adopt the very unlikely theory of this being an interpolation, it shows that the writer of 12 (and not of 12. 1–9 only) was the writer of 1. Thirdly we must observe that the writer of 1, whoever he was, clearly meant in some degree to suit his style to his subject, and in writing about heroes to adopt a more or less heroic or, as Plato might have called it, dithyrambic tone. In §§ 7, 10, 13 the expressions and the order of words appear to me to depart deliberately from the prosaic, though not in a very marked way, and though the vocabulary is not poetical. Other poetical touches are the plurals ἀγραῖ (1: cf. κυνηγέσια), αἴρια (10), perhaps γάροι (7 cf. ὡς ποτ' ἥρασθη γάμων Σεμέλης *Eur.* *Hipp.* 453 for the whole phrase) and the words κλέος (6), νέκιος (17), ἀνίκητος (17). Θεά (6), though not usual in prose, must be taken here as necessary to avoid the ambiguity that would have arisen from θεός: we have the more usual ἡ θεά in 10. Θεός ὡς (6) is borrowed from the poets almost as straight as ἐρίζειν (12) from Il. B. 555. Ἐρυξε τυμᾶσθαι (8) is a very unusual construction, and perhaps not right, as τοῦ may easily have fallen out. But possibly there was poetical warrant for it. On ἐν λόγοις ἥν (11) see note below. The most markedly poetical expression in the chapter is ἔχάρη τῷ δώρῳ (2). Δῶρον itself is a word mainly poetical, except in the technical sense of bribery, which δῶρα bears in the orators and laws: δῶρα is the regular prose word. X. however and Plato make free use of δῶρον. But there is no mistaking the poetical character of ἔχάρη (see Veitch, *Greek Verbs*, p. 696), whether we adhere to χαῖρη in *Plat. Rep.* 606c or alter it to χαίρης. The writer certainly had poetry, perhaps some particular passage, in his mind. Ἀναγορευθῆναι

(14) is a somewhat disputed form, but similar ones appear in X. (*Mem.* 1. 2. 35) and elsewhere, and this may stand or fall with them.

Δικαιότης (1) is an uncommon word which both X. and Plato use two or three times. The markedly substantival use of *καλά* with or without an article, sometimes with a pronominal or adjectival word attached to it (2. ἔτέρων *καλῶν*: cf. 12. 8 *τῶν ἄλλων καλῶν*, and ἔτέρων *χρησίμων* in 13. 2) is familiar, like that of *ἔστατα*, in Pindar, but not common in prose. In X. cf. *Mem.* 2. 1. 27 *καλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν ἐργάτην*: *Symp.* 8. 17 *τὰ τοῦ παιδὸς καλά*: *Hell.* 2. 4. 42 *πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλοις καλοῖς*. For *θαυμαζέτω μηδεῖς* (3) cf. the remark on 2. 2 above: for *πολὺν ὑπερέσχε* (11) that on 4. 1. Cf. *πολὺν διενεγκόντες* (5), *τοσοῦτον ὑπερέσχε* (7), *τοσοῦτον ὑπερέβαλε* (12). *Αἴτιοι Τροίαν ἀλώναι* (13) is paralleled by *Hell.* 7. 4. 19 (*αἴτιος ἐδόκει εἶναι τὴν μάχην στρατόπεδον*): 7. 5. 17: *An.* 6. 6. 8, and the only parallel which I find quoted to *τοὺς πατρώντας καὶ μητρώντας θεούς* (15) is *Hell.* 2. 4. 21 *πρὸς θεῶν πατρώντας καὶ μητρώντας*. The single connecting *τε* (cf. 10. 23: 12. 8: 13. 11) occurs in 18.

In spite of the ornate style, no attempt is made to avoid hiatus. Notice for instance 10 *πατρὸς δὲ γέροντος ἐπιλανθανομένου τῆς θεοῦ οὐχ αἵτοντος*.

Without pretending then that in this chapter there is much to be recognised as Xn., I think we may say that it certainly contains nothing in the vocabulary which is

inconsistent with his authorship. He was at all times addicted to the use of semi-poetical words, partly perhaps from natural inclination, partly from having picked up outside Attica words and usages not so familiar in Attic speech as among other Greeks. As to the topics and tone of the chapter, it seems arbitrary to say that X. can never have written so. In the *Cyropaedia* there are long passages of a tiresome and to some extent ornate kind. We have seen reasons for accepting the whole of the *Agisilaus*, which contains a good deal of writing not in his usual vein. There is indeed nothing in *Cyropaedia* or *Agisilaus* so bad as this. But we do not know at what time of his life X. may have written it. It need not have been composed at the same time as the body of the book. It may proceed from the immature taste of boyhood or the failing judgment of old age. We should be sorry to think that he composed it in the full vigour of his faculties, but still with all his merits X. was far from being a great writer, and there is no knowing what he might do in some ambitious attempt. The writer of the *Cynegeticus* carefully separates himself from the Sophists and modestly professes to be a mere layman in writing (13. 4): but a man does not always mean what he says, and he may very well have thought that he could, if he chose, beat them at their own weapons.

H. RICHARDS.

(*To be continued.*)

UPON MANILIUS.

i. 269, *sqq.*

in cuius caudam contento derigit arcu
mixtus equo, volucrem *mittens iam iamque*
sagittam.

So we should write for the *missurus* of the MSS. It is an insult to the memory of Manilius to suppose that he wrote the vulgate with its postponement of *que* as feeble as it is licentious. Nothing parallel has been adduced. It is quite a different thing to place *-que* where it can eke out a dactyl in the second half of the pentameter, an affection of Tibullus found in some other poets; and any one can feel that the position of *-ne* in Prop. 3, 16, 5 ‘quid faciam? obductis

committam mene tenebris?’ bold though it is, is amply defended by the emphasis. The cause of the corruption is obvious, one of the two following *iam*'s was omitted and *missurus* was an inevitable metrical correction. If some prosaic reader had glossed *mittens* by *missurus*, the corruption was still easier. I see that in essentials Bentley has anticipated this correction, though he writes with less probability *iam mittens*. For *iam iamque* with the pres. part., compare v. 435 ‘intentans morsum, similis iam iamque tenenti.’

i. 412, *sqq.*

tum nobilis Argo
in caelum subducta mari, quod prima eucurrit,

emeritum magnis mundum tenet acta periclis,
seruando dea facta deos.

Palaeographically nothing could be easier than Prof. Ellis' proposal to read *apta*, in the sense of 'adepta,' for *acta*, which is quite indefensible (*Noctes Manilianae*, p. 9). But the participle is weak and superfluous. Nothing else worth mentioning has been proposed. I would suggest that we should read 'emeritum magnis mundi tenet alta.' Though I change more letters than Prof. Ellis, I obtain a construction which would have been very puzzling to a copyist and therefore very liable to corruption. For 'emeritum magnis periclis' is in apposition to the whole verbal notion 'mundi tenet alta.' The Argo has gained the heights of heaven—a distinction fairly earned by the great perils that she has undergone (*periclis*, it may be observed in passing is a quite indefensible expression). The construction may be illustrated from Hor. serm. 2, 1, 53 'dente lupus, cornu taurus petit, unde nisi intus monstratum?'

ii. 581 *sqq.*

In the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxv. p. 267, I have proposed a restoration of this passage which is not however complete, as it leaves the incoherent order of the manuscript. It should be read and arranged as follows :

idecirco nihil ex semet natura creauit
582 pectore amicitiae maius nec rarius um-
quam,
589 perque tot aetates hominum tot tempora
et annos
tot bella et uarios etiam sub pace labores
591 cum Fortuna fidem quaerat, uix inuenit
usquam.
583 unus erat Pylades, unus qui mallet
Orestes
ipse mori: lis una fuit post saecula
mortis,
alter cum raperet mortem, non cederet
alter.
haec duo qui potuere sequi uestigia,
poenis
optauitque reum sponsor non posse
reuerti
sponsoremque reus timuit, ne solueret
ipsum.
592 at quanta est scelerum moles per saecula
cuncta
quamque onus inuidiae non excusabile
terris!

The three lines 582-591 clearly belong to the general statement of the proposition,

afterwards proved in detail, that nothing is so rare as true friendship. Not only so, but when they are placed in their true position, we can at once understand the cause of their displacement. It is that frequent source of error—homoioteleton. The scribe's eye travelled from the *umquam* of 582 to the *usquam* of 589. The omitted lines were inserted in the first convenient place, that is before 592.

I should feel ungrateful if I failed to avail myself of the opportunity to thank Mr. E. J. Webb for the very full and kind review of my *Silua Maniliana* in the *Classical Review* of last July. At the same time I would add a few observations which were suggested by the perusal of that review.

On ii. 538 *sqq.*

ipse suae parti Centaurus tergere cedit;
usque adeo est homini uictus. quid mirer ab
illis
nascenti Librae superari posse trigonum?

Mr. Webb dwells on the difficulty of the datives of the agent, *homini*, *Librae*, which seems to him increased by their occurrence in two consecutive lines. I confess that I do not feel that Jacob's *homini uictus* 'subjected to the man' is a whit more difficult than 'cuiquam genitus' (iv. 896) which I quoted or 'abreptusque patri Torquatus' (v. 107) of Torquatus ordered to execution by his father, and 'indutusque Ioui est' (ii. 491) of the Ram whose shape Jupiter assumed, which I might have quoted. As to 'terrea... remissa' i. 759 it seems impossible to me to translate it 'excused the earth'; but let that pass. However I do and did feel the obscurity of the second dative very acutely; and hence in the *Silua* I proposed 'Libra' which would do away with all difficulty, and though I said that Manilius 'perhaps' wrote *Librae*, I am now prepared, it may be boldly, but I trust not audaciously, to maintain that the vicinity of *nascentis* corrupted *Libra* into the genitive.

I think Mr. Webb has hardly apprehended my argument on iv. 204 *sqq.*, which perhaps was not made sufficiently clear in my discussion. The MSS. have

Libantes noctem Chelae cum tempore lucis
[per nova maturi post annum tempora Bacchi]
mensurae tribuent usus ac pondera rerum.

As the whole context shows, Manilius is speaking only of the effects which being born under a 'Balance' would have upon the character and history of the *partus*. He

will be able to weigh and measure and assign. He will be a second Palamedes—a jurisconsult—a Seruius. Lastly he says ‘denique in ambiguo fuerit quodcumque locatum | et rectoris egens, diriment examina Librae.’ Now it is quite true, as Mr. Webb, quoting iii. 662 and ii, 658 *sqq.*, says, that Libra is connected with Bacchus as presiding over the time of the vintage. But this reference is entirely beside the mark here where the essential potency of the sign is set forth. Hence I regard v. 205 as an interloper, which has found its way into the present passage, because *Librantes*, which has been restored to the text by conjecture, was early corrupted into *Libantes*, the actual reading of every known manuscript of Manilius; and this corruption naturally suggested the connexion between Libra and the vintage.

The star which rose with the 26th degree of Libra (v. 338) will I am afraid never be discovered. For Mr. Webb says that we have ‘no right to suspect that Manilius made Antares rise with the 26th degree of Libra.’ But my friends of the Greenwich and Cambridge Observatories (*Silua*, p. 68), unless I have altogether misunderstood them, said that in the time of Manilius it did approximately rise then.

In conclusion let me touch on two literary points. Like Mr. Webb, I do not feel certain that Manilius has imitated Propertius. I have always used the word ‘uidetur’ (*Silua*, pp. 23, 46, 70) in speaking of their resemblances, to which I would here add two: Manilius i. 326 *sq.* (of Orpheus), ‘Manesque per ipsos | fecit iter domuitque infernas carmine leges.’ Prop. 4, 11, 3 ‘cum semel infernas intrarunt funera leges.’ Manilius ii. 24 ‘pacis opus’ may be a re-

miniscence of Prop. 3, 1, 17 *sq.* ‘sed quod pace legas, *opus* hoc de monte sororum | detulit intacta pagina nostra uia’ as the general subject of the whole context is the same. The difficulty of determining the question of obligation is that Manilius so frequently gives a fresh turn to a thought or expression of his predecessors which prevents its provenance from being apparent, and, as I have said in my preface, ‘prioris... non tam exprimit quam aemulatur.’ I believe that he had read Catullus; but I have only noticed one clear imitation, and that is not apparent until we have accepted Prof. Ellis’ excellent emendation of ii. 476 *sq.* ‘affectus quoque *divisit* uariantibus astris | atque *aliorum* oculos, *aliorum* contulit aures’ (*aliorum—aliorum*) = Catullus in the epithalamium 62, 15 ‘nos alio mentes, *alio divisimus aures’*. The resemblance is unmistakable; but how different the surroundings! Finally as Mr. Webb has protested against my selection of i. 715 ‘resupina facit mortalibus ora’ as a fine line (I am sure he would agree that it forms part of a fine passage), it may interest some of our readers to know that in the blank pages at the end of H. A. J. Munro’s copy of Jacob’s Manilius, a book now in my possession, there is only one entry and that is a transcript of the words in question. Though Munro was no great admirer of Manilius, as we know from the references to him in the commentary on Lucretius, it would seem that he thought the line a remarkable one. The idea which it conveys is, it is true, a simple one, the upturning of the face to the sky; but the expression is vivid and novel.

J. P. POSTGATE.

CICERO, PRO CLUENTIO.

§ 6. *Tum si quid erit praeteritum animo requiratis.* Some MSS. have a *me* for *animo*: read *animo a me requiratis*.

§ 9. *Quoniam caput illius atrocitatis... fuit innocentem pecunia circumventum.* ST give *quoniam illius caput etc.* Read *quoniam illud caput illius etc.*

§ 15. *O mulieris scelus incredibile et praeter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum.* I incline to think that Cicero may here have written *unum* instead of *unam*, though the latter seems to occur in all MSS.

§ 31. *Hanc a natura [propriam] lucem accipere.* *Propriam* should be entirely removed from the text: it has probably resulted from the misunderstanding of an adscript *propitiā*.

§ 34. *Quid de Oppianico suspicatus sit videtis, [quid iudicari obscurum non est]; nam cuius etc.* The parallelism with what follows (*videtis...cognoscile*) suggests that the words which I have bracketed are superfluous, and have come in from the margin.

§ 39. For *tum suffragiis* read *tandem suffragis*.

§ 51. *Quod non possim [implere].* *Implere* does not occur in ST, the archetype of which seems to have abounded in contractions: read *quod non possim praestare*.

§ 53. *Quaerebat cur in eiusmodi locum [tam abditum] cur solus cur cum obsignata pecunia venisset.* *Tam abditum* has all the appearance of an adscript.

§ 72. *Hic ille planus improbissimus condemnatum iri.* In this passage Madvig proposed to delete *sese ab Oppianico destitutum*. But the source of the corruption does not lie there. Earlier in the sentence occur the words *queritur se ab Oppianico destitutum*. The removal of these words effects a great improvement in the whole period. And there can be little doubt as to where they came from. They are obviously 'index-words,' written in the margin to serve as a guide to a famous passage. Another instance of such 'index-words' creeping into the text will be found in *agitur causa* § 58: possibly also *aliqui Oppianicum gratis condemnavit* § 113. Cp. § 173.

§ 76. *Statuerunt.* Madvig proposed *statuerent*: perhaps rather *staterunt*.

§ 79. *Clamore hominum* ST is probably right for the vulgate *clamore*. The source of the confusion may be looked for in the preceding line where *opinionibus hominum* should perhaps be *opinionibus omnium*.

§ 83. *Cur cum in consilium mittebant Staienum iudicem cui quod tu dicis pecuniam dederant non requirebant.* Here S gives *cui quod*, T *quod*, and most codd. *cui*. Accept the reading of S and insert the words *tu dicis* after *quod*. Their resemblance to *iudicem* in what goes before may have caused their omission.

§ 84. *istam dedit conciliationis et gratiae fabulam.* These words, rejected by most editors, do not seem to be of the stuff of which adscripts are made. There is, in fact, something contemptuous in the repetition of the words used by Accius, which Cicero is, as it were, pillorying: ep. *haec illius reconciliatio* § 101. For *dedit* I should, however, read *edidit*.

§ 98. *Qui . . . dixerunt, qui accusati sunt ab iis qui erant...condemnati, quos ego.* Müller and Fausset retain this intolerable sentence in the form in which it occurs in the MSS. But there should be a full stop at *dixerunt*, and perhaps the best way to amend what follows is to read *Quid? Accusati sunt etc.*

§ 103. *Potest . . . accepisse tamen ob rem iudicandam pecuniam sicut causam pecunia*

capta nusquam Staienus eadem lege dixit. The words which I suggest for insertion here in order to fill a lacuna in the text will be found to convey the essence of the argument. The suggestion is of course based on the homoeoteleuton *pecuniam—pecunia*: ep. § 66 *ante iudicium datam, post iudicium* *eruptam*, where the words *datam, post iudicium* have slipped out in ST. In the text, the first *pecuniam* is not essential, as *acepisse* is often used absolutely.

§ 107. *Longum est de singulorum virtute ita dicere; quae [quia] cognita sunt ab omnibus verborum ornamenta non quaerunt.* In this much discussed sentence, the simplest remedy is, retaining the *ita* before *dicere* (Madvig altered it to *illa*), to remove *quia* from the text. Its presence is probably due to dittography, and the reflection which Cicero intended to make was a general one.

§ 113. *Iam *putaretur aliqui . . . sedisse.* *Putaretur* occurs in ST. Now in § 31 ST and b² all agree in *putaretur* while the other codd. give *videretur*. Unless *putaretur* be a mistake for *putetur* (ep. *arbitraretur* in the codd. for *arbitretur* §§ 25 and 96) I am inclined to think it is the result of a misunderstood contraction for *videtur* (or *videntur*?). The other MSS. have worked out the problem to *potuit*, which Müller adopts: but *potuit sedisse* is not likely,—*poterit* would be preferable. Read therefore *iam videtur* (*videntur*?) *aliqui . . .*

§ 124. Read *unum denique aliquod a Cluentio aliquando profectae pecuniae vestigium ostende.* T omits *aliquod* after *denique*: S has *aliquid* after *Cluentio*. Probably both *aliquid* and *aliquando* should find a place in the text: ep. § 92 *si in aliquam legem aliquando non invaverat*.

§ 127. *Aliquid esse et quod de his duobus habuerint compertum de ceteris comperrisse.* The insertion of *non* (before *comperrisse*) by editors, following Graevius, does not seem to be the true line of emendation for this difficult sentence. There is a parallelism in *aliquid esse* and *comperrisse* which must not be overlooked. The insertion of *et* before *quod* seems to be the first step required in order to recover this parallelism. Then if *aliquid esse* cannot mean by itself 'that there is still a something' (i.e. something not generally known, ep. § 149), which is the sense required by the context, it is here that emendation must be attempted. *Aliquid esse postea cognitum et quod . . . habuerint compertum . . . comperrisse* may be taken as representing the sense of the passage, as I understand it.

§ 153. *ceterique eiusdem ordinis.* This

reading is now generally adopted by editors. Most codd. have *ceterique huiuscemodi (eiuscmodi ST) ordinis*. Perhaps in a direct appeal to the representatives of the equestrian order on the bench before him, Cicero may have said *huiusce vestri ordinis*.

Ibid. I suspect the words *haec recusarent et*: they may have arisen out of a marginal gloss on *recusando* in the line above, *cum haec recusarent*.

§ 173. There is something odd about *Faciliusne potuit quam in poculo*, which seems again a sort of abridgment of the whole argument that may have come in from the margin. Following *venenum* at the close of the preceding sentence, I should propose to continue at once *Num latius potuit abditum aliqua in parte panis etc.*

§ 192. *Mulierem quandam Larinatem illim usque a mari supero Romanam proficisci*. This is Müller's reading, adopted by Mr. Fausset. Madvig proposed *Larino atque illim*: the codd. give *Larino atque illam*. It seems to me that *Larino* ought to stand: and the

exclamations of the bystanders might best be expressed by *Mulierem quandam Larino adesse: illam usque etc.* In the direct 'Mulier quaedam Larino adest' would naturally be followed by some such 'nearer definition' as 'Illa usque a mari supero Romanam proficiscitur' etc.

§ 195. *Vos iudices, quos huic A. Cluentio quasi aliquos deos . . . fortuna esse voluit.* 'Quasi aliquos deos' is Halm's emendation, and is accepted by Müller and Fausset. But *deos* here cannot be disconnected from *deos* in the preceding sentence,—*deos...aspernatos esse confido*. The MSS. give *quos alios T, alios S*. Here *alios* is undoubtedly right, 'other gods,'—different, that is to say, from the *di immortales* of the previous sentence. I propose, accordingly, to return to the reading of Lambinus (adopted by Classen and Ramsay) *quosdam alios deos*, or rather (on palaeographical grounds) *alios quosdam deos*.

W. PETERSON.

McGill University, Montreal.

QUIS FOR ALIQUIS?

The following essay will treat either textually or exegetically these passages:

Plautus, <i>Captivi</i> 45 sq. " (Rudens 925)	i si	quis	120 times
" <i>Bacchides</i> 274	ii quasi	"	3 "
" <i>Mostellaria</i> 655 (cf. <i>Amph.</i> 563, <i>Pseud.</i> 1130)	iii ubi	"	6(?) "
Terence, <i>Eunuchus</i> 252 " 511	iv quando	"	2 "
" <i>Heautontimorumenos</i> 458	v quom	"	1 "
" <i>Adelphi</i> 443	vi num-	"	very common
Cicero, <i>de Finibus</i> 3, 21, 70-71	vii ee-	"	"
Horace, <i>Sermones</i> , 1, 3, 63	viii an	"	3 times
Cicero, <i>ad Atticum</i> 6, 1, 6 " <i>de Officiis</i> 3, 6, 60	ix -ne	"	1 "
" <i>de Natura Deorum</i> 1, 24, 66.	x comparative } + quam }	"	1 "
	xi ne	"	passim
	xii nisi	"	"

He makes the following classification:

i si	quis	120 times
ii quasi	"	3 "
iii ubi	"	6(?) "
iv quando	"	2 "
v quom	"	1 "
vi num-	"	very common
vii ee-	"	"
viii an	"	3 times
ix -ne	"	1 "
x comparative } + quam }	"	1 "
xi ne	"	passim
xii nisi	"	"

None of these usages would be held to run counter to the classical prose style. In a few examples however an at random use of *quis* for *aliquis* has been claimed; these Prehn reviews, and denies the claim. *Capt. 43 sq.*

reducemque facit liberum in patriam ad patrem
inprudens, itidem ut saepe iam in multis locis
plus insciens *quis* fecit quam prudens boni.

¹ Strassburg, 1887.

By denying the 'Plautinity' of the prologues Prehn removes the difficulty here. The question of the genuineness of the prologues may after all be an open one (cf. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* p. 184 *sq.*) and we need not go into it now. It may be that we should correct *quis* to *qui* in this passage, a correction involving no more than the assumption that *quis fecit* is ditto graphic for *qui fecit*. The passage lends itself to the following translation :

'And he will fetch him back free into his own country to his father,
All unawares,—just as often times before
now in many a place,
The man who (*qui*) 'builded better than he knew.'

We may consent to waive the difficulty of the position of *qui*, I think, if we examine some of Vergil's trajections; *Aen.* x. 530 *sq.*:

Aeneas contra cui talia reddit :
argenti atque auri memoras *quae* multa
talenta etc.

Aen. x. 708 :

...aper multos Vesulus *quem* pinifer annos
etc.

Vergil may also be cited for a simile very like the one under discussion, so far as construction goes; *Aen.* ii. 379 *sq.*:

improvisum aspris *veluti qui* sentibus anguem
pressit humi nitens trepidusque repente
refugit
attollentem iras et caerulea colla tumentem,
haud secus Androgeos visu tremefactus
abibat.

For my own part I am inclined to doubt whether an indefinite *aliquis* might stand at all in our passage. We know how in Greek the gnomic aorist arose out of the typical specific instance, and so here I take *qui fecit* as a gnomic phraseology such as we see in the *qui pressit* of the Vergilian sentence.

The next passage cited by Prehn, *Rud.* 925, falls away, for the manuscript reading does not give *quid* but *quidem* and so all the late texts read.

At *Bacch.* 274 etiamn'est quid porro?

Prehn corrects quite unnecessarily by put-

ting a question-mark after *est*, instead of simply referring the example to his class ix.

The three remaining examples amount to but one, being but varieties of the same oath-formula. I cite only *Most.* 655 :

malum!—quod isti di deaeque omnes duint.

Prehn's explanation of this oath is as follows : "ne id quidem constat, tres ultimos versus, in quorum introitu *malum quod* legitur, huic usui vindicandos esse. Fortasse 'quod' illud nihil aliud est nisi particula aliqua optativa, ita ut idem fere atque 'qui' valeat." As my punctuation has already hinted I propose to take *quod* as a relative, interpreting 'the deuce!' may *it* take you (and not me) etc.'

From Terence Prehn cites *Eun.* 252 :

negat *quis*; nego etc.

and *ib.*, 511

roget *quis* - ne noram quidem.

It does not seem to have occurred to him that these are protases, and that thus *quis* for *aliquis* gives a very broad hint that *si* has been omitted.

The examples for *quid* are as follows :

Heaut. 458 :

ptyissando modo mihi
quid vini absumpsit, 'sic hoc' dicens, 'asperum,
pater, hoc est etc.'

Here *quid* is clearly equal to *quantum*. I compare Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 133 : *quid praeterem caelati argenti? quid strigulae vestis? quid...? quid...? quid marmoris apud illum putatis esse? tantum scilicet quantum e multis splendidisque familiis in turba et rapinis coacervari una in domo potuit.*

The remaining Terence example is *Adel.* 443 :

haud cito mali *quid* ortum ex hoc sit publice

and here it is most easy to read *mali<ali>quid*. I feel some difficulty, however, in the interpretation of this line but chiefly if *ortum...sit* be taken as a perf. subj.; I can see no reason why we should not confine *ortum* to predicative apposition with *<ali>quid*, and render the verse as follows : 'there would not likely be any evil to the state with him as its source (*ortum ex hoc*).'

It is barely possible however to take *cito* as a verb, used here in a mock-solem, mock-official sense 'I will not undertake to pro-

claim etc.' In that case *hoc* must needs be neuter referring to what has gone before, with the sense of 'this ill custom.' Terence seems however not to have used the verb *cito*, if the Delphin index can be trusted, though Plautus has it two or three times.

Lewis's article on *quis* in Harpers' Latin Lexicon (q.v. i. A.) is particularly inadequate in its treatment of *quis* as a random substitute for *aliquis*: Plaut. *Pseud.* 1284 has to fall away since the Ambrosianus reads *aliquis*. The two citations from Tacitus show *quis* after *quantum*, and fall of course under the rule for relatives. Cicero *de Fin.* 3, 21, 71 is a stock citation, but Riemann (*Syntaxe Latine*² § 12 Rem. 1) tacitly explains it in explaining in the same connection *de Fin.* 3, 21, 70: fatentur alienum esse a iustitia—detrahere *quid* de aliquo: here *detrahere quid* is a substitute for *si quid detrahatur*.

An instance is cited from Horace *Serm.* i. 3, 63:

simplicior quis et est qualem me saepe
libenter
obtulerim tibi, Maecenas, ut forte legentem
aut tacitum inpellat quovis sermone: 'mo-
lestus
communi sensu plane caret' inquinus etc.

Here *simplicior quis* is a protasis with omitted *si*, just such as we saw in the two passages of Terence's *Eunuchus* cited above.

The Latin grammars sometimes give the formula *dixerit quis* when they treat of the potential subjunctive, and some of them treat this subjunctive as apodotic, always implying an omitted protasis (e.g. Allen and Greenough 311a). Roby (*Latin Grammar* ii. p. ci. sq.) makes a strong argument to prove that this is a future perfect. He could cite, in what is presumably a nearly complete list of examples, but two examples of *dixerit quis*, the rule being *dixerit aliquis* or *quispiam*; the passages are Cic. *de Off.* iii. § 76: 'non igitur faciat' dixerit quis 'quod utile sit, quod expediat?' immo intellegat nihil nec expedire nec utile esse, quod sit injustum, and *ib.* § 102: 'quid est igitur,' dixerit quis 'in iure iurando? num iratum timemus Iovem?' To me it seems perfectly clear that in the former passage *dixerit* and *intellegat* are a protasis and apodosis, while in the latter dixerit is taken up at the end of § 103 in the apodosis (sed) *prima videamus*.

I cite from Roby (§ 1545, 1542) the following examples with *aliquis* which seem to me to make for this explanation: Cic.

Verr. 4, 5, § 10: *dicit aliquis*; 'noli isto modo cum Verre agere.' sic *agam* etc., where *agam* is a clear apodosis to *dicit*. At Livy 37, 53, 25: 'quid ergo postulas?' *dicit aliquis*. ego, patres conscripti... nullos accolas nec finitimos habere quam vos *malo* etc. the apodosis in *malo* (= *dico me malle*) to *dicit* is very clear. These passages bring to mind the standing ellipsis with the parenthetic purpose clause of a principal sentence with *dicam* (*dico*), though Cicero uses the fuller form occasionally (cf. *pro leg. Manil.* § 20). The protatric nature of this construction is clear from the nearly fixed position of the pronoun after the verb, with the verb at the head of the sentence; while the use of *quis* for *aliquis* seems also to lend weight to this explanation. It may be noted however that *dixerit quis* is inserted within the bounds of the statement under quotation, and this seems not to be true of the longer indefinite *aliquis*, though *dixerit quispiam* corresponds in regard of this once to *dixerit quis*, and once to *dixerit aliquis*. Of course the greater frequency of *dixerit aliquis* shows that the Romans had lost consciousness in Cicero's time of the finesse shown by Terence in using *negat quis* for *siquis negat*. The preference for *aliquis* was due to the formal absence of *si*, though we cannot doubt that in Terence's time *quis* might have been used to palliate that formal absence.

Zumpt's *Grammar* cites Cic. *ad Att.* 6, 1, 6: [His de causis] credo Scaptium iniquius *quid de me* scripsisse, but Nobbe reads *de me aliquid* and so do Boot and Wesenberg. If there is any manuscript warrant for *quid* here we may well believe that *quid de me* *scripsisse* stands for *quid de me <scriperit> scripsisse*, *quid...scriperit* echoing a '*quid Scaptius dixit?*' that was floating in Cicero's mind.

Another passage is *de Off.* 3, 6, 30 where *aut* precedes *quid*: now in either a capital or minuscule manuscript *aut* is liable to be read *ali* and our manuscript may have stood originally *AUTALIQUID*, which would be shortened by haplography to *aut quid* (cf. Lindsay's *Textual Emendation* p. 87).

At *Nat. Deor.* 1, 24, 66 the text reads *priusque te quis de omni vitae statu, quam de ista auctoritate deiecerit*. Here we may argue that *TEALIQUIS* was the original reading and there was a skipping from *TE* past *LI* owing to their similar ductus. It is not impossible though that the text ran originally *QUEPRIUSQUIS* which would be first copied *que prius quis*, and then corrected to

' noli agam dicet. tulas' ? scripti... quam do (= clear. anding clause (dico), occasion protacte- r from ronoun end of or ali- is ex- r that ends of this definite sponds quis, e the shows ness in by negat. o the cannot night formal

1, 6: quid me If quid me rit> quid ero's

here capital to be have d be (cf.

eads ham ay read- ast not g in first to

priusque<te> quis, te being an emendatory insertion from a grammatical scribe. We cannot justify *prius...quam quis* here as at Plaut. *Men.* 846 where *priusquam...quid* is equivalent to *ne quid*.

I have now gone through all the cases of *quis* as a random substitute for *aliquis*, so far as I can trace them up in any books accessible to me. Every one of them is either capable of a syntactical interpretation that correlates it with the employment of *quis* as a regular substitute for *aliquis*, or

has a textual environment which would have let *ali-* fall away easily by haplography. Under these circumstances it seems to me that every such alleged use of *quis* must be subjected to an examination for itself; and in Plautus and Terence, for whom I have given above what are presumably all the occurrences, the evidence seems to me to permit us to deny any such usage of *quis* altogether.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

NOTE ON A CAMBRIDGE MANUSCRIPT OF THE *DE SUBLIMITATE*.

THE Cambridge University Library possesses a manuscript of the *De Sublimitate* which has often excited the interest of foreign scholars. There has, in fact, been some disposition, both at home and abroad, to hint that the manuscript is an insufficiently prized treasure. Early in the century Benjamin Weiske, in his edition of the treatise, expressed the view that an accurate collation of the entire codex was to be desired; and his opinion has been echoed by subsequent editors, such as Spurdens, Vaucher, and Pujol. No report on the manuscript has, I believe, hitherto been published in response to these suggestions. I venture, therefore, to print a few memoranda recently made at Cambridge.

The general result of an examination of the manuscript is, I fear, disappointing. The Codex Cantabrigiensis—or Codex Eliensis, as it is more usually called—is very late. It is an Italian manuscript, belonging probably to the early part of the sixteenth century; the year 1530 A.D. might be named as an approximate date for it. The reputation of late Italian manuscripts is well known; and in the present instance all late manuscripts suffer from the inevitable comparison with the early and excellent Codex Parisinus (P 2036) of the *De Sublimitate*.

The cases in which Cod. El. presents a better reading than P 2036 are so rare that, when they do occur, they may pretty safely be regarded as corrections of a more or less obvious sort. In xxvii. 1, for example, Cod. El. has *πρέποντα* where P gives *τρέποντα*. The former reading is clearly preferable, and it now stands in the best continental editions. But there is, neither here nor elsewhere, anything to lead us to suppose that El. is not derived, ultimately, from P.

At the same time it is only proper that El., here as elsewhere, should receive any credit to which it is entitled. Iahn-Vahlen and Spengel-Hammer in their critical editions, and Rothstein in *Hermes* xxii. 544, attribute the reading *πρέποντα* to Robortello, not knowing (in the absence of the collation desiderated by Weiske) that any manuscript authority for it exists. Similarly in iii. 4 Iahn-Vahlen report *ρόπικὸν* as the reading of P, and *τροπικὸν* as the reading of the remaining manuscripts. As a matter of fact, Cod. El. coincides here with P, as also in vii. 2 (*ἀνάθημα*), in ii. 2 (*παροπίσαι*), and in many other instances.

Another case in which Iahn-Vahlen ascribe a reading to Robortello will be found in ix. 9. The late form *θεσμοδότης*, which Robortello there gives in place of *θεσμοθέτης*, is however found in El. In view of this and similar points of resemblance there seems some probability in the suggestion Dr. Rendel Harris makes to me that El. may have supplied the groundwork of the *editio princeps* published by Robortello at Basle in 1554. In xxii. 4 it is interesting to note that, in El., *αὐχησον* has been changed, by the scribe himself I think, into *αὐξησον*. Rothstein (*Hermes* xxii. 537), together with Iahn-Vahlen and Spengel-Hammer, regards *αὐξησον* as a conjecture of Robortello's; and so it may have been if we may imagine that Robortello himself introduced the alteration into El., or that it was made at a later time from his edition. Of course we must not exclude the further possibility that El. is of an even later date than that above suggested. If so, it might be a transcript, instead of being the original, of Robortello's edition. But if it is a transcript, it is certainly (as could easily be shown) not

an exact transcript. On the whole, the probability appears to be that it had some share in inspiring Robortello's text, which for that of an *editio princeps* is surprisingly good. Some of the references entered in the margin of the manuscript seem to connect it with Switzerland. For instance, in x. 6 El. gives a marginal reference, for a quotation from Aratus, to '137 in codice Basiliensi,' where the number of the page (137) corresponds with that of the edition of Aratus published at Basle in 1536. Again, in xix. 1 a similar reference is given, for a passage from Xenophon, to '384, 1 in Cod. Genev.,' where the page (384. 1) corresponds with that of the edition of Xenophon published (probably at Geneva) by H. Stephanus in 1561. It is a much-disputed question what Robortello's source was, and the above considerations render it possible that El. may have contributed something to a text which tallies exactly neither with it nor with any other known manuscript, and which may be to some small extent the outcome of conjectural emendation on the part of the editor himself.

In the margin of El. there are not only references to authors, but also some Italian notes, written in a neat and elegant hand, apparently of a somewhat later date than the MS. itself. As these notes are of some interest and have not, as far as I am aware, been previously printed, I give them here. It will be seen that they seem to accord with the edition of Manutius rather than with that of Robortello. They all occur in the latter half of the treatise. The first (Cod. El. fol. 28 v.) refers to the long passage quoted (xxxii. 5) from the *Timaeus* of Plato: *tutto questo è confusamente preso da Platone*. The criticism thus conveyed is just; the citation is a loose one. The second (fol. 31 v.) relates to the words *τό γέ το περὶ Φρύνης* (*φρυγίης* P) *ἡ Ἀθρογένεις λογίδων ἐπιχειρήσας γράφειν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἀν* 'Υπερίσην συνέστησεν (xxxiv. 3): *tutto questo dubito che sia stato trasportato dal margine nel testo, et che sia giudicio di qualch' uno che biasima Longino, perchè da tante lodi a Hyperide*. The relevance of this remark is not obvious, but Manutius acts in the spirit of it when he omits the suspected words from his edition. Robortello, on the other hand has them. The third note (fol. 37 v.) runs: *in Herodoto non si leggono così continuare queste parole*. The words in question are those quoted from Herodotus in *De Subl. xliii. 1*. They are taken, as the note implies, from separate passages of Herodotus (vii.

188, vii. 191). The last note (fol. 40 v.) is: *qui manca perauentura qualche voce significante altro uitio che seguita le gran ricchezze, et poi uien dietro καὶ ἀλλα*. There certainly appears to be some slight lacuna in the passage, though opinions may differ as to what it is and where it comes. Both Robortello and Manutius retain *ἀλλα*, which later editors, beginning with Pearce, have mostly altered into *ἄμα*.

These are all the Italian notes. A word may be added as to the general relation of Manutius' text (as given in his edition) to that of the Codex Eliensis. There is no close conformity between them. Sometimes (e.g. ii. 1 *φησί*, iii. 1 *κέκραγά πω*, iii. 4 *μῆτροι*) the manuscript gives the better reading; at other times (e.g. ii. 2 *δειλότερα*, ii. 2 *τόλμη*, ii. 2 *δεῖ γὰρ αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*, iii. 1 *κατανθρακώσομαι*, iii. 3 *δυνψιλακτότατον*) the edition. In ii. 1 *φησί* (singular) originally stood in El., but it has been altered into *φασί*. It may be added that the better readings of Manutius are often found in the margin of El.

The relation of El. not only to Manutius' text and that of Robortello, but to P 2036 and other MSS., might well be illustrated by a passage in i. 2, 3, where the correct text in all probability is: *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἡμῖν, ἑταῖρε, τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους, ὃς πέφυκας καὶ καθηκει, συνετικρινεῖς ἀληθέστατα εὖ γὰρ δὴ ὁ ἀποφράμενος, τί θεοῖς ὅμοιον ἔχομεν, ἐνεργεσίαν* 'έπειτας 'καὶ ἀληθεαν.' γράφων δὲ πρὸς σέ, φίλατε, τὸν παιδίας ἐπιστήμονα, σχέδον ἀπήλλαγμα κ.τ.λ. In this passage the best readings are in all cases preserved by P 2036,

viz. πέφυκας (πεφυκασ P), ἔχομεν, εἴπας, and φίλατε τόν. In the first case and the last, El. and all the other MSS., together with Rob. and Man., give *πέφυκε* and *φίλατον*. In the remaining two cases El. resembles P in presenting the better readings *ἔχομεν* and *εἴπας* (*ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπών* in marg. P), while all the other MSS. give *ἔχομεν* and all (with two exceptions) give *εἴπε*, which reading also appears in the margin of El. (*ἴστ. εἴπε*). Both Rob. and Man. have the better reading *ἔχομεν*, and both have the worse reading *εἴπε*. The general conclusion to be drawn from an examination of this and other passages appears to be that, while El. cannot claim to have any independent worth when compared with P 2036, it is in some respects superior to the remaining MSS. and to the editions of Robortello and Manutius.

The text of the *De Sublimitate* presents many points of special interest, with regard to which it is natural to interrogate any

unexamined manuscript. But if we look to Cod. El. for fresh light in such matters, we shall hardly find it. Its ascription of the treatise is the traditional one, the name of Longinus being found on one of the blank leaves at its commencement. Nor is there any variation from tradition in the form of the names Κεκλίου and Φλωρεντιανή which occur in the opening sentence. The usual lacunae, again, are indicated in ii. 3, ix. 4, xii. 2, xviii. 2, xxx. 2, xxxvii. The marginal additions in El. are couched, as has already been indicated, in Latin or Italian, while Greek alternatives are introduced by the customary contractions γρ. or ἥσ. In the earlier part of the text there occurs more than once a special symbol of which the significance is not clear; perhaps it is meant for the guidance of the printer, though it can hardly indicate the beginning or end of paragraphs. At the conclusion of the treatise El. terminates abruptly with the word ἡμῖν, but a Latin note ('nam cecilius aliter scribebat, vide 6. 7') implies that δοκέι must be added to complete the sense.

With regard to the history of the MS. little is known. It owes its title of *Eliensis* to the fact that it was once in the possession of John Moore (b. 1646, d. 1714), a Fellow

of Clare College, who was bishop successively of Norwich and Ely. Moore's famous library of manuscripts and books was purchased by George the First, and by him given to the University of Cambridge. I see some reason to suppose that the Codex Eliensis thus acquired may be identical with that which since Langbaine's time has been called *Duditianus* or *Junianus*, but which exists nobody seems to know where. Andrew Dudith, the Hungarian divine, was a friend of Robortello and Paul Manutius. He had travelled in Italy, and was conversant with the Italian language. In the year 1555 (the date of the publication of Manutius' edition, that of Robortello having appeared in the previous year) Dudith was in England in the train of Cardinal Pole. That he was interested in 'Longinus' to the extent of completing a translation of his work, we know from a passage in the Preface (1571 A.D.) to his version of the *De Thucyd. Histor. Iudicium* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is possible that in translating the *De Sublimitate* he made use of the codex subsequently called both by his name and by that of the Patrik Young (*Junius*) from whose hands it passed into those of Langbaine.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

MENANDER'S Γεωργός.

SINCE Prof. Blass discovered that the six fragments of the Menander papyrus edited last year by Prof. Nicole, form only one leaf, and that the 87 lines or parts of lines are therefore to be read continuously, there is even less upon which to reconstruct the plot of the play than there was in Prof. Nicole's arrangement of the fragments. At the same time, what there is of course more intelligible, and the foundation given more secure. I venture to offer, not a reconstruction, which would be folly, but a few remarks on the situation, as it may be gathered from the fragments themselves. I give, in the first place, the situation as I gathered it from reading the text of the papyrus as edited by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, and from the 'other known fragments of the Γεωργός,' printed at the end of their edition. I purposely refrained from reading their Note on the Dramatis Personae, Translation, and Commentary, until after I had arrived at the conclusions here offered:

NO. CVII. VOL. XII.

a fact I mention merely because any slight value that my remarks may have arises solely from the fact that they are an independent corroboration of Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt's view of the piece.

The young man who is speaking when our papyrus fragment begins, and who may be called, for brevity, the Lover, is the lover of a girl (*τὴν κόρην* l. 30, *τὴν παιδὰ* l. 74), has already seduced her (*ἡδυκηκώς* l. 30, ep. Fragments (2) (3) (4)), and would gladly marry her, as is evident from his desire to escape the *γάμος* arranged for him by his father (ll. 5-21): but though she is free-born (Fragm. (5) *κόρη ἐλευθέρας*), her family is poor (Fragm. (2) *τὴν ὑμετέραν πενίαν*, where *ὑμετέραν* implies at least two persons: ep. Fragm. (3) [P.S. also l. 80 *τὸν δυστυχέν*: see below!], and the Lover has not ventured to tell his own father of the *liaison* (Fragm. (5): ep. the evident ignorance of the Lover's father in arranging the *γάμος* for his son). *ἡ κόρη* has a brother, *ὁ μειρακίσκος* (l. 4:

▲ ▲

I. 18 τὸν ἀδελφὸν, ll. 46, 67 τὸ μειράκιον, I. 70 τῆς ἀδελφῆς), who at some time previous to the opening of the play has gone to work in the country on the farm of Cleaenetus, ὁ γεωργός,—the title-role (ll. 4, 18, 46). The mother of these two, Myrrhine by name, is one of the speaking characters of the papyrus (I. 58 ὁ μειράκιος is called her son ; cp. her helpless grief in the scene with Philinna ll. 22–31, and ll. 86, 87). Myrrhine is aware of her daughter's condition, and knows who the seducer is ; facts she has communicated to an elderly (I. 25 ὁ τέκνον, I. 54 γράδιον) friend, Philinna, who is indignantly sympathetic and quite ready to bring τὸν ἀλαζόνα (I. 26) to book.

Matters have now reached a crisis, because the Lover's father, taking the opportunity of his son's absence on business at Corinth, has prepared a surprise for him on his return in the shape of a marriage with his own daughter, his son's half-sister (I. 10 ὄμοτατρία). The papyrus introduces us to the Lover, lately arrived home to find the marriage preparations well advanced. In the conflict of his fear of disclosing his *liaison* and his desire to avoid the γάμος, he has left his father's house without making any disclosure or objection, and is now hesitating whether or no to knock at his sweetheart's door. His hesitation is due to his ignorance as to whether the brother has come back from the country or not ; but whether he wishes to find or to avoid the brother is not absolutely clear (see below). In these first 20 lines then, we have the normal young lover of the New Comedy, so familiar to us in Plautus, timid and hesitating, not at all devoid of good feeling, but incapable of forming a plan of action, and one feels sure that there was the confidential slave somewhere in the play to get him out of one difficulty and into another.

As the Lover goes out, *enter* Myrrhine and her elderly friend, Philinna. Myrrhine has just confided her troubles to Philinna, who has more than half a mind to break in upon the marriage preparations with the announcement of the bridegroom's 'villainy.' Myrrhine, of a temper more apt to lachrymose resignation, is inclined to wash her hands of the young man. To these enters Davus, whom Myrrhine recognises at once as "the servant, Davus, coming from the country" (ll. 31, 32), and who, with an inferior fellow-slave, ὁ Σύπος, is bringing flowers and evergreens for the wedding. That Davus and Myrrhine are well acquainted is evident from the whole scene ; that Davus does not belong to Myrrhine's

household follows of course from the situation as here conceived, because he is evidently a servant of the house where the γάμος is to take place. Further, his mode of addressing Myrrhine, γεννικὴ καὶ κοσμίᾳ γίνεται, is more natural if Myrrhine is a neighbour than if she is his master's wife, or a lady of the family. Davus brings news from the farm of Cleaenetus : and in all probability it is the same farm which has supplied the flowers and which Davus characterises (ll. 35–39) in the usual mocking manner of the comic slave. That there should be some connection between the Γεωργός and the Lover's family on the one hand and the Γεωργός and the wronged girl's family on the other, is probably one element in the entanglement of the plot. The news that Davus brings to Myrrhine is that, her son having nursed Cleaenetus through an illness consequent upon a self-inflicted spade-wound in the leg, the latter, in gratitude for such filial attention (I. 58 οἰορεῖ ροπήρας ἐφρῶν πατέρι), has promised to marry the youth's sister, Myrrhine's daughter (I. 74). 'They (i.e. Cleaenetus and ὁ μειράκιος) will be here directly,' says Davus : 'he (Cleaenetus) will go back with the girl to the country' ; and he apparently adds something to the effect that the family will be satisfied, and that the girl might do worse than accept the retirement that this match with an elderly farmer offers. Lines 77–79 are, however, almost entirely wanting. This news of Davus only sends the anxious and tearful mother into greater agitation, and the papyrus leaves her wringing her hands and exclaiming, 'I don't know what to do now ! O dear, τίνος η πᾶς ἔστι !'

So far it seems fairly plain sailing. But lines 67–71 raise an interesting question. There we are told that the old farmer, as he lies idle and convalescent, 'inquires into the young fellow's affairs.' 'What affairs?' says Myrrhine (according to the text of Grenfell and Hunt, which seems probable). Unfortunately the answer of Davus is considerably mutilated. He seems to say that perhaps the farmer was not altogether unacquainted with the young fellow's affairs ; but that the latter told him about his sister, and (if Grenfell and Hunt are right in inserting <τε>) about Myrrhine and somebody else whose name is lost. Now one's first impulse is to suppose that the μειράκιος had learnt, either before leaving home or since he was on the farm, of his sister's situation, and that this is the subject of his conversation with the farmer. But would it not be carrying gratitude to a high pitch of absurdity, even

for a sentimental *άγροικος* of the New Comedy, to promise to marry the sister knowing that her good name is already compromised? And it is not necessary to suppose that the conversation between the invalid and his young nurse related to more than the poverty of the latter's family, the charms of his sister, and his desire to see her comfortably settled. Whether we suppose the *μειρακίσκος* to be acquainted with his sister's situation or not, will depend partly on our interpretation of the Lover's speech (l. 4 and ll. 18, 19). It is evident from l. 4 (whether *ἐν* φέδη be the right supplement or not) that the *μειρακίσκος* 'was still in the country' at the time of the Lover's visit to Corinth. And it is probable that in ll. 18, 19 the Lover is anxious to avoid the *μειρακίσκος*. He hesitates about knocking because he does not know whether or no the *μειρακίσκος* is at home again. Suppose he wishes to *find* the *μειρακίσκος*. Then what is he afraid of? Evidently of meeting some other occupant of the house. But that danger is present in any case, and therefore his ignorance of the presence or absence of the *μειρακίσκος* would, on this supposition, be no reason (*γάρ*) for his hesitation. But if he wants to *find* his sweetheart or her mother, and to *avoid* the *μειρακίσκος*, his hesitation is naturally caused simply by his ignorance of the latter's whereabouts. Now why is it that the Lover wishes to avoid the *μειρακίσκος*? From the indication afforded by ll. 4–6, connecting in some way the absence of both the *μειρακίσκος* and the Lover with the paternally arranged *γάμος*, it is plausible to suppose that what the Lover fears is that the *μειρακίσκος*, coming home, has learnt, from the marriage preparations next door, or from his sister's confession, or both, to regard him as the treacherous seducer of his sister. This still leaves us in doubt whether the *μειρακίσκος* was formerly (as would be quite in keeping with the typical New Comedy) an accomplice of his sister's Lover, until he discovered the impending *γάμος* with another; or whether the love-affair had been unknown to him. On the whole I prefer the latter alternative, partly because, if he had been the Lover's accomplice, the Lover's first idea would probably be to find him and explain how matters stood, partly because the conversation of the *μειρακίσκος* and the *γεωργός* seems to me better understood in accordance with this theory.

The shorter fragments throw practically no light upon the plot, other than the slight indications I have noted above. (5) is ad-

dressed to the Lover, probably by his confidential slave. It might on the other hand be spoken by the Lover's father after the *dénouement*, the present tenses being merely exclamatory. (1) is of course a remark of the farmer after he has come to town. (2) should also, I fancy, be given to the farmer. He addresses this bit of proverbial philosophy to Myrrhine perhaps, or to the *μειρακίσκος*, but anyhow includes the family in its scope (*ἱμερέας*). (3) and (4), both addressed to Gorgias, whose name appears nowhere else, are both, I believe, spoken by one person on one occasion. The speaker is attempting to restrain Gorgias from resenting his wrongs in a rash or unmeasured manner: and he appeals to his reason, pointing out that, however much he may have right on his side, he is only a poor man, and *εὐκαταφρόνητος* in consequence, and, if he goes to the Lover's father to complain, he will be treated as a mere *συκοφάντης*, telling his tale merely for the sake of *τοῦ λαβεῖν*. If this reading of the two fragments be correct, Gorgias can hardly be any other than the *μειρακίσκος* himself (or his father, if his father is alive, which seems rather unlikely). The speaker is not unlikely to be a slave, whose object is to prevent an inopportune *dénouement*: if so he is probably in league with the Lover's slave; or maybe he is our friend Davus himself, who was evidently on friendly terms with Myrrhine's household.

Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt say (p. 17): 'following Nicole and Blass we should identify Gorgias with the father' of the Lover. This, of course, is quite possible. But *εὐκαταφρόνητος* does not seem to me to be so *naturally* addressed to the Lover's father by someone attempting to win his attention to the tale of wrong, as to the girl's brother burning to go to the Lover's father with the said tale. And I venture with diffidence to suggest that the two pieces, both in tone and subject, harmonise very well in the account given of them above; whereas the suggestion (Grenfell and Hunt, p. 26) that (3), as well as (4), is an 'expostulation addressed to Gorgias by someone who wished to reconcile him to the marriage of his son with the poor girl in place of the *δύοπατρία*', seems to leave the expressions *κἄν πάνυ λέγῃ δίκαια, συκοφάντης, κἄν ἀδικούμενος τύχῃ*, quite untouched.

In the above account I assumed that Davus was a slave of the Lover's father's household. I see that Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt (p. 17) make him the servant of Cleaenetus. Line 32, to which they refer, leaves this point doubtful, since *ἔξ αὖρον* may

be taken with *προσέρχεται*. But I prefer their assumption, because it suits the lines in which Davus talks about the farm better than the supposition that he is a town slave. And, if this is the right assumption, *τοῦ δυστυχεῖν* in l. 80 probably refers merely to the poverty of Myrrhine's family, which is clearly of great importance to the play, and which may have been the result of some special *δυστύχημα* and therefore particularly sensitive to *τοὺς ὄρῶντας*.

How the plot of the play was complicated and then unravelled it is impossible to say. No doubt a good deal was made of the old-fashioned honesty of the farmer in contact with the manners and customs of the town. And of course the marriage preparations

with which the play opens are not wasted; nor can one doubt that the Lover and his sweetheart are finally united. That the farmer should be tricked into courting the *δυοπατρία* instead of Myrrhine's daughter; or that there should be one of the favourite *ἀναγνωρίσεις* of the New Comedy and the farmer turn out to be Myrrhine's husband, or the *δυοπατρία*'s true father, and the *δυοπατρία* be left to pair off with the *μερακίσκος* (if he were old enough)—any of these and many other suppositions might be true and probably would be false. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt must find some more of the papyrus!

NOWELL SMITH.

THE NAME DOULICHION.

IN the long controversy concerning the site of the Homeric 'Doulichion' scarcely enough attention seems to have been given to the name itself and its unusual termination. It is derived, no doubt, from *δολιχός*, 'long,' the *o* being due to a lengthening of the *o* for metrical convenience, as in *δολιχόδειρος*. In this and similar words, e.g. *Πειρίθοος*, *δλεσίκαρπος*, we must suppose a variation in pronunciation which came to be marked in writing either by a 'hybrid' diphthong (*Πειρίθοος*) or a long vowel (*ἀλεσίκαρπος*).¹ Apart from its ending, the name sufficiently explains itself as a makeshift poetical designation of a 'long' coast-line, which I would identify on other grounds (see my 'Greek Epic,' note on *Od.* ix. 1, ff.) with Leucadia. But we cannot regard the termination as one which went originally with the name as that of an island or peninsula; for all the names of Greek islands, which are adjectival, are feminines in *-ia* or *-η*, and the rest end in *-os*; whereas *-ov* regularly belongs to a promontory, *ἄκρον* being understood. I would meet this difficulty by two suppositions. First, that the region in question was called by the early Greek navigators and the poets after them simply *Δολιχή*, 'the long,' no authentic local name being known to them. Secondly, that one of its promontories (*Kap Dukato!*) was called correspondingly *Δολίχον*, and this, though properly belonging to the promontory, happened to

¹ Cf. Wilamowitz 'Homerische Untersuchungen,' ii. 3.

find its way into the loose Homeric nomenclature and, in particular, into the recurring 'tag,' *Δουλίχων τε Σάμη τε καὶ ἴλιγεστα Ζάκυνθος*, denoting vaguely the coast lying somewhere beyond Same (Cephallenia) and Ithaca. The geographer of *Od.* ix., who placed Ithaca to the west instead of north-east of Same, must have known less of Leucadia, but he knew enough to group it with Ithaca as a land which might own Odysseus as suzerain. The name Leucadia only came in when Leucas, the city, was founded from Corinth in the seventh century. The germ of it, however, may possibly be found in the *λευκὴ πέτρα* of *Od.* xxiv. 5 and the name *Λευκός* as a companion of Odysseus (*I. iv.* 498). If so, it may be considered as in favour of the view suggested that such a 'rock,' i.e. promontory, appears in this connection as within the ken of the *Odyssey*. It may have been the same headland which, under the other name 'Dolichion,' stood for the intermediate coast-land between the islands known by real names (Ithaca, Same, Zaconthus) and the more northerly and all but unknown 'Phaiakie.' It is no wonder that a name so vague and, so to speak, accidental, disappeared without leaving any trace in Greek geography. As the true name 'Leucadia' took hold, 'Doulichion' went adrift, and the geographers from the poet of the Catalogue to Strabo sought a place for it among the Echinades!

G. C. W. WARR.

THE NATIONALITY OF HORACE.

SINCE writing my article on the meaning of the word *Sabellus* (*Class. Rev.* for October, 1897), I have received two communications bearing on the point, and both confirming the view which I expressed, that *Sabellus* means 'Samnite,' not 'Sabine' as our dictionaries say. (1) Prof. Conway refers me to the second edition of Brugmann's *Grundriss* vol. i. p. 128, which entirely supports my contention from the philological point of view. Brugmann derives *Sabellus* from *Safno-los*,* *Samnium*, Oscan *Safinim*. (2) Mr. Heitland refers me to Strabo v. 4, § 12, p. 250. After speaking of the 'ver sacrum' which is said to have led to the establishment of the Samnites in Samnium as an offshoot of the Sabines of Sabina, Strabo goes on:—*Eἰκὸς δὲ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Σαβέλλους αὐτὸς ἵτοκοριστικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν γονέων προσαγορευθῆναι, Σαμνίτας δ' ἀπ' ἄλλης αἱρίας, οὓς οἱ Ἑλλῆνes Σαννίτας λέγονται.* His philology is at fault; for he regards *Sabellus* as a diminutive formed directly from *Sabinus*. But that does not affect the main point, which is that we have here explicit testimony that *Sabellus* was a name applied to the *Samnites* (not the Sabines). As yet no scrap of evidence has been produced to show that *Sabellus* ever meant 'Sabine.'

The inference is inevitable. When Horace calls himself a *Sabellus* (*Epp.* i. 16–49), he cannot be alluding to his possession of an estate in *Sabina*, but must be speaking of his connexion with *Samnium*. In what way

was he connected with Samnium? Not exactly by the place of his birth; for Venusia is in Apulia, and the places mentioned in connexion with his early childhood (Acherontia, Bantia, Forentum; *Od.* iii. 4, 14–16) are in Lucania; and when Horace speaks geographically, he says of himself *Lucanus an Apulus onceps* (*Sat.* ii. 1, 34). I think, therefore, he must be referring to his nationality; and that in this passage (*Epp.* i. 16, 49) we have a direct but hitherto neglected statement by the poet himself as to his blood and descent. To ancient biographers the nationality of the son of a *libertinus* was perhaps of little moment; but to us the question is more interesting. For it has been suggested that Horace was of Greek origin: so Dr. Gow in his recent edition. Prof. W. M. Ramsay in *Macmillan's Magazine* for 1897, p. 450, speaks of Horace as an Apulian; but 'Apulian' is, I take it, a geographical not an ethnological term. It is possible, though I cannot prove it unless by reference to the case of Horace himself, that there were Samnites as well as other nationalities in Apulia. The supposition that Horace was a Samnite is in perfect touch with what we know as to his personal character, and throws new light upon the passage in *Sat.* i. 9, 29, where the Sabellian crone is mentioned, in connexion with his early childhood. I conjecture that he came of a family which had been enslaved during the Samnite wars.

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

SOPHOCLES, *TRACH.* 345: PLAT. *GORG.* 470.

καὶ δὴ βεβᾶσι, χῶ λόγος σημανέτω. Prof. Jebb rightly retains this, the MSS. reading, as against various needless conjectures. He translates 'Well, they are gone;—so thy story can proceed'; and, for the use of *σημανεῖ* he refers to l. 598 *τί χρή ποεῖν;* *σημανεῖ, τέκνον Οἰνέως.* But it seems to me that the proper parallel is to be found in Thucydides in whom *σημαίνει* is absolute, as in ii. 8, 3 *ἔδοκει ἐπὶ τοῖς μέλλοντι γενήσεσθαι σημῆναι,* v. 20, 2 *ἔι τὰ προγεγενμένα σημάνει,* ii. 43, 3 (perhaps) *οὐ στηλῶν σημάνει ἐπιγραφή.* The construe of the line should be, I think: 'Well, they are gone, and so let thy story be the token (viz. that they are gone)': i.e. 'speak out plainly and freely.'

Plato, *Gorgias* p. 470 A *οὐκοῦν, ὁ θαυμάσιε,* *τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι πάλιν αὖ σοι φαίνεται, ἐάν μὲν πράττοντι ἂ δοκεῖ ἐπτραπεῖ τὸ ὀφελίμως πράττειν,* *ἄγαθόν τε εἶναι καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔσκει, ἐστὶ τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι εἰ δὲ μῆ κακὸν καὶ σμικρὸν δύνασθαι.* The position of *μὲν* and of *τε* and the parallelism of the sentences seem to me to leave no doubt (1) that Plato meant *εἰ δὲ μῆ* (*ἐπεται κ.τ.λ.*), (*τὸ μέγα δύνασθαι φαίνεται*) *κακὸν* (*εἶναι*) *καὶ σμικρὸν δύνασθαι*; (2) that *καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ μ.* δ. is an afterthought substituted for *καὶ μέγα δύνασθαι.* Accordingly I infer (1) that Plato intended to play on the double meaning of *σμικρὸν δύνασθαι a.* 'to have small power,' *b.* 'to signify little'; (2) that the construe is 'So your view seems to

be that great power, provided that "doing as one chooses" is accompanied by "doing as is advantageous" is both a good thing—and this is, as it seems, "great power": but, if this condition is absent, great power

appears to be a bad thing and to signify little.' This rendering is quite different from those given by Thompson, Stallbaum, Deuschle-Cron and others.

E. C. MARCHANT.

HAVERFIELD'S REVISION OF CONINGTON'S VIRGIL, VOL. I.

Conington's Virgil. Vol. I. *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Fifth Edition, revised by F. HAVERFIELD, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford; London, George Bell and Sons. 1898. 10s. 6d.

THE first volume of Conington's *Virgil*, which had previously been re-edited by Prof. Nettleship, now appears in a fifth edition, which has been entrusted to the care of another Oxford scholar, Mr. F. Haverfield. The three names which thus appear upon the title-page suggest some natural regrets, but the succession of editors, though rapid, is a worthy one—*uno avulso non deficit alter aureus*—and long may the University preserve the 'golden' chain of Virgilian critics undeteriorated and unbroken.

The appearance of this volume must also be hailed with satisfaction not only as a proof of the permanent value of Conington's work but also because the demand for its publication seems to show that the *Georgics*—'the best poem of the best poet,' as Dryden calls them—do still find students, in spite of the efforts of schoolmasters and examiners to relegate them to obscurity in favour of the *Aeneid*. Doubtless the imaginative power of the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* and the splendid rhetoric of the Fourth are unsurpassed, but elsewhere in *Virgil* there is nothing which can rival the *Georgics*. Written at the average rate of one line a day they represent the most perfect artistic work of the greatest artist in words whom the world has ever seen. They deserve, but in comparison with the *Aeneid* have not received, the most careful criticism, so that the appearance of a new edition of what will be for long the standard English authority about them seems a fitting occasion to draw attention to certain points in which Conington's judgment may reasonably be questioned and this edition improved. There is all the more cause for doing so since, when an edition has secured general acceptance by its merits, there is a

strong tendency to elevate it into a sort of 'canonical' book and—as I have often experienced personally—to treat any dissent from its conclusions as a sign of presumption and almost heresy. To the classical student, however, a contented acquiescence in authority is fatal, and it is far better to err greatly than to accept blindly. Nor probably would any man have been more indisposed to consider his own judgment as final than Conington himself, and indeed, even where the grounds for a decision appear clear and cogent, he often seems to shrink too sensitively from expressing a definite opinion, for fear lest he should prejudge a case on which the last word has not yet been spoken. Criticism moreover on a writer so subtle, so suggestive, and often so ambiguous, as Virgil cannot in every case hope to obtain finality, nor can any commentator hope to avoid mistakes which a fresh, though less competent critic, may be able to emend. It happens, too, that my own school edition of the *Bucolics* and *Georgica* synchronizes with the publication of Mr. Haverfield's more important volume, but as my own work will not naturally come before scholars a notice of the latter in the *Classical Review* seems a fitting opportunity for referring to those points in which Mr. Conington's opinion seems, either to Mr. Haverfield or myself, to need correction.

Before, however examining these points in detail it ought to be said generally that Mr. Haverfield's very delicate task of revision has been excellently performed and with a degree of self-effacement which, while it greatly adds to the convenience of the reader, should not make him overlook the labour and learning which are required to produce a result at once so simple, accurate and clear. By breaking up the original notes into short paragraphs he has much improved their lucidity, to which also a much improved type greatly contributes, while throughout he has made a great number of short additions of his own on

special points, which are of high value. The following instances will illustrate their character :

Grammatical—

E. 1, 18 *qui deus*; 1, 67 *en unquam*; 3, 21 *non redderet?*; 4, 62 *rido* with dat.; 5, 66 *ecce* with acc.; 8, 102 *ribo = in rivotum*; 9, 53 *oblitus* passive; 10, 12 *ullus = ullus modo*; G. 1, 203 *atque*; 1, 263 use of perf. *impressit*; 3, 258 the *dativus energicus* (a new terror!); 3, 384 *primum* with no *deinde* or other particle to follow; 4, 117 *ni traham...canerem*; 4, 159 *saepta domorum*.

On special words—

E. 7, 33 *sinum*; G. 1, 14 *cultor*; 1, 93 *penetrabilis*; 1, 247 *intemperata nox* (an admirable note); 1, 360 *carinae*; 1, 470 *obscenus, importunus*; 1, 498 *Indigetes*; 2, 104 *neque enim = 'nor indeed'*; 2, 364 *immito*; 2, 403 *olim cum*; 3, 12 *palma = 'victory'*; 3, 560 *abolere*; 4, 443 *pellacia*; 4, 445 *nam quis?*

Orthography—

E. 3, 84 *Pollio*; 4, 229 *thensaurus*; 4, 243 *stelio*.

Botanical, Historical, &c.—

E. 2, 18 *vaccinium*; G. 4, 271 *amellus*; 3, 338 *alecyon*; 4, 307 *hirundo*; 4, 511 the nightingale; 13, 25–33; 3, 31–33 not *ex post facto*; 3, 38 *Ixionis angues*; 4, 48 burnt crabs; 2, 161 the Lucrine harbour; 2, 171 Octavian in the East; 2, 479 earthquakes producing earthquakes waves in Italy.

His chief defect is too great tenderness in dealing with the notes added by Nettleship and the incorporation of fresh *Marginalia* from the same hand. These, as is well known, largely deal with rather minute textual and orthographical questions so that for non-technical students they often rather mar the effect of the commentary. Not one person in a thousand who reads Virgil cares at all how the MSS. spell *sed*, *haud*, and *obliquus* while, when a note on the orthography of *formosus* occurs eleven times within the first seven *Elegies*, the feeling aroused is almost indignation. Such notes have their value, but their place is not in the commentary on an incomparable poem. They ought to be omitted or relegated to an Appendix, and then room might be found for some much-needed notes on some of the marvellous merits of the *Georgics*. True, the student ought to find these out for

himself, and it might be called impertinence in an editor to draw attention to them, but the plain fact is that they usually elude the observation of the general reader and often are but imperfectly grasped even by scholars. Two illustrations must suffice. The first is Virgil's use of *personification*—the art by which he gives feeling and personality to every creature, animate or inanimate, which he describes, not merely to bees and cattle but to plants and shrubs, even to wines, as a careful study of the wonderful passage G. 2, 88–109 will show. The second is his astounding mastery over metre, which in the first *Georgic* may be illustrated by a greater number of passages than can be quoted from any Latin poem of twice or four times the length, although the average reader is only dimly conscious of the existence of half of them while only devoted study can reveal the fulness of their perfect art.

Appended are notes on some of the passages in which Conington seems to his editors or myself to need alteration or amplification. Even put most tersely they run to some length, but the interest of the subject is sufficient excuse. Conington is referred to as C., Nettleship as N., and Haverfield as H.

E. 1, 46. *ergo tua rura maneunt*. *Ergo here—admirantur cum maerore coniunctae exclamatio*, Orelli—needs illustration from Hor. Od. 1, 24, 5 *ergo Quintilium...*, and S. 2, 5, 101 *ergo nunc Dama sodalis nusquam est*. In the next line C.'s description of Virgil's farm as 'covered with stones' quite misrepresents *lapis nudus*='bare rock' which crops up and 'overspreads' (*obducatur*) the pastures.

1, 65. H. rightly reads, and well explains, *cretae* (not *Cretae*) *rapidum*; but line 67 the purposely disjointed character of the shepherd's broken utterance demands notice; it is quite in Virgil's way cf. 3, 93; 9, 2.

1, 71. H. makes *barbarus* and *impius* excellently clear.

2, 18. *ligustra* 'privet.' So C., but surely Martyn's 'white convolvulus' or 'bindweed' (cf. *ligo*) fits sense and derivation better.

2, 28. *tantum libeat tecum mihi sordida rura...* H. rightly quotes Martial, but should do so more fully, and refer to Friedlander on 1, 49, 27 for *sordida* in a distinctly good sense.

2, 30. *viridi compellere hibisco i.e. ad viride hibiscum* C. But C.'s quotation 'Hor. Od. 1, 24, 18 *quam...nigro compulerit Mer-*

curius gregi' is fallacious, for (1) surely the use of the dat. after *compello* when it describes driving an individual to join a flock is entirely different from its use when it describes driving the flock to the particular thing on which it feeds, and (2) the omission of the words *virga aurea* vitiates the quotation altogether, for they afford an exact parallel to *viridi hibisco*, if we render with 'a green switch of *hibiscum*', and 10, 71 shows that the plant was used for making baskets and therefore might furnish a switch.

2, 47-50. It should be noted that there are probably two bouquets; the first is of flowers of contrasted hue mixed with scented plants, and the second, described in inverse order, of scented herbs and contrasted flowers. In 50 the difficult epithet *mollia* applied to *vaccinia* needs a note; surely Wagner's *quac coloris teneritate sensum mollier afficit* is right.

3, 79, 80. All discussion of these difficult lines is practically wanting in C.

4, 4. The note on *Cumaei carminis* is excellently re-written by H.

4, 11. *decus hoc aevi*. H. rightly notes 'may mean "This glory of the age"', as it certainly does. C. gives 'this glorious age,' comparing Lucr. 2 16 *hoc aevi quodcunque est*, which is not parallel, *aevi* depending on *quodcunque*.

6, 2. Delete the full-stop after *Thalia*. The sentence is 'At first my Muse was pastoral... (but) when I began to sing of kings etc.'

6, 33. H. with H. N. gives *his ex ordia primis*, but would Virgil use this rare device twice in a few lines (cf. 19 *ipsis ex vincula sertis*), with such a rare word as *ordia*, and where confusion with *exordia* was certain?

6, 34. *omnia et ipse tener mundi concreverit orbis*. C. accepts Munro's 'elastic globe of ether,' but *omnia et ipse = rá τε ἀλλα πάντα καὶ*, and the earth is the only truly central object which can be contrasted with 'all other things.' Again *concreverit* better describes the formation of a central mass than of an unsubstantial enveloping ether. Again *tener orbis* naturally leads up to *tum durare solum*.

6, 70. *Ascreao seni*. H. rightly takes *seni*, not of antiquity as C. does, but of 'the venerable old age...generally associated with poets.'

8, 38-42. Macaulay's famous praise of these lines (*Life and Letters*, 1, 371) should be quoted in any edition.

9, 3. H. has an excellent note on *possessor*

'a word associated with violence,' e.g. *Sullani possessores*.

9, 25. H. with H. N. reads *antesinistra*, a ἄπ. λέγ., on the authority of Servius. 'Learned' poets no doubt like technical terms, but they use them with judgment, and a word so hideous as this is impossible. It is not criticism but eccentricity to split *exordia* into two and join *ante sinistra* into one word.

9, 23. *dum redeo*. H. rightly renders 'until' this usage being certain.

G. 1, 4. H., with H. N., rightly refuses to follow C.'s identification of *lumina* with Liber and Ceres.

1, 20. *et teneram ab radice ferens, Silvane, cupressum*. C. writes 'ab radice with *ferens*, condensed, as Cat. 64, 288 *tulit radicitus*.' This is to me without meaning, and when I turn to Ellis on Catullus I am equally mystified. He writes 'in Virgil however *ab radice* seems to be "from the root upwards," whereas *radicitus* is rather "torn from the roots": in other words *tulit radicitus* is the more pregnant expression.' Surely the god of forestry is carrying a 'young cypress' taken up from the roots, i.e. so as to bring the roots away with it, in order that he may transplant it. It is the sign of his work, which certainly was not to pluck young trees from their roots!

1, 28. *venias*. H. rightly 'thou comest,' not as C. 'become'; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1, 2, 30 *venias preciamur...Apollo*. This use of *venio* is pictorial and illustrates its use in Aen. 5, 344 *gratior et pulchro veniens in corpore virtus* and 5, 373 *qui se | Bebrycia veniens Amyci de gente ferebat* (cf. 5, 400), where editors raise needless difficulties.

1, 36. The use of *nam* needs a note. After mentioning earth, sea, and sky, Virgil says '(I do not mention the fourth division of the universe) for hell etc,' but this usage is not always clear, and in 1, 77 C. in consequence quite misses the point. There on *urit enim lini...* he writes 'The general sense is that the same crop invariably repeated, will exhaust the soil etc.' This is wrong, for every one knows that the same crop cannot be repeated invariably, and the whole paragraph is on 'alternation' or change, which land *must* have and may get (1) by the costly method of fallowing (2) by rotation of crops, e.g. by following wheat with vetches and lupine (but not with flax, oats, etc.) 'for flax and oats exhaust the soil,' though, Virgil adds, even these crops may be planted if you do not stint manure. The whole passage is strictly coherent and absolutely clear.

e.g.
ra, a
vius.
nical
ent,
ible.
split
into
ders
uses
with
ne,
ens,
us.'
n I
ally
ver
oot
orn
ulit
on.'
a
ots,
in
the
to
st,'
30
nio
5,
ore
ens
ere
te.
gil
on
ge
in
re
al
oly
is
me
he
or
ret
2)
at
x,
he
ps.
re.
and

1, 80. *ne saturare fimo pingui pudeat sola, nevs.* The rugged rhythm of this rude precept should be noted.

1, 104–117. This disputed passage needs clearer treatment. The great point to notice is that it is in two accurately balanced halves of seven lines each, one beginning with *quid dicam...qui* the other with *quid qui*, one describing irrigation of light dry soil, the other draining of a rich wet one. This is certain, and therefore Mr. Long's view (quoted by C.) that *male pinguis harenae* in the first half is = 'too stiff soil' is hopeless, while in the second half *bibula deducere harena* is almost necessarily = 'drain by the use of sand which drinks up the water,' the reference being to *closed drains* (= our 'sub-soil drains'), made by digging a trench, half filling it with sand, gravel, &c., and then filling it in, as described in Columella 2, 2, 10 and Theophrastus, *C.P.* 3, 7.

1, 106. *rivoque sequentes.* H. with H.N. reads *recentes* against all authority and in defiance of Homer where cf. ὀχέηγρος and ἵγειονεύη, while the pursuing water at last 'outruns its guide' (*φθάνει δέ τέ καὶ τὸν ἄνοντα*). A worse alteration was never made.

1, 169 seq. Much in C's description of a plough needs revision. The common drawing of a plough as given in Smith's *Dict. of Ant.* is from Martyn and so, I suppose, 150 years old. It sadly needs amendment and causes needless difficulties, e.g. "what does C. mean by 'The plural *dentalia* is used by this poet (Virgil), but it is probably nothing more than a poetic license'? *Dentalia* is plural because the word describes two pieces of wood fastened on each side of the *buris* and holding the *dens* at the point of convergence, while at the other end they pass into the *aures*, together with which they form a *duplex dorsum* exactly as described by Virgil. A handy classical friend rigged me up a little model which showed them admirably.

1, 206. *vectis* = 'voyaging' 'while sailing.' C.'s difficulty as to the use of the past part. in a present sense is imaginary. Four similar instances occur in this Book, 293, 339, 442, 494. H. adds a note which shows this, but leaves C.'s comment, causing some confusion.

1, 243. *sub pedibus* = 'beneath our feet,' opposed to *nobis sublimis* 'above our head.' C. writes 'sub pedibus' is to be connected with *videt*, the feet being those of Styx and the Manes; but *videt* is not to be pressed, &c.' Anyone who tries to realize these ghosts looking at a pole beneath their feet

will see how impossible it is. What, too, about the feet of Styx?

1, 277. H. on *Orcus* = "Ophos is excellent.

1, 281–283. C. has a vague note on 'Greek rhythm,' but the rhythm of these three lines deserves most careful study. The double hiatus between *i* and *i*, *o* and *o* in the first is startling and in marked contrast with the triple caesura in the second. The first line—which must be read slowly—marks slow upheaval, the second ponderous settlement of mountain upon mountain, and then comes the miraculous third line—*Ter Pater extuctos deicet fulmine montes.* First the long gigantic effort then the consummate ease with which it is reduced to nothing could not be better expressed. Yet among all the comments on Virgil has anyone ever seen this third line noticed? I never did, and yet I think Virgil must have been very proud of it.

1, 299. *nudus ara*, 'without the upper garment,' C. and all editors. But if so, why did the wags in Virgil's time scoff at the line? No one could laugh at you for telling a ploughboy to take off his jacket, but they could if you told him to 'strip.' Is not Virgil thinking of a ploughman wearing only the *cinctus*? Cf. *cinctuti Cethegi Hor. A.P.* 50 = *nudi Cethegi Lucan* 6, 704.

1, 322. Much cleared up in H.

1, 356. *continuo, ventis surgentibus, aut freta ponti.* H. gives *continuo* = 'immediately, in quick succession,' and suggests that it might be *αὐτίκα* 'for example.' The meaning is clear. *Continuo* goes closely with *v. surgentibus* 'the moment the winds begin to rise'; cf. 169 *continuo in silvis* 'while still in the woods'; 3, 271 *continuoque ubi* 'from the moment when,' and above all 4, 254 *continuo est aegris* 'from the moment when they sicken,' where Virgil is describing the *first* symptom of disease as here the *first* sign of wind.

1, 362. *densis alis.* 'looks like a mis-translation of *τινάζαμενοι πτέρα πυκτά*', C. I cannot easily believe in the 'mis-translation.' Surely Virgil deliberately alters Aratus to a phrase which fits in with the *military* words *agmine magno* and *exercitus*.

1, 467. H. has a most interesting note to show that there was no solar eclipse in B.C. 44.

1, 500. *iuvarem* = Augustus. H. has a good note; the use of the word by both Horace and Virgil is too marked to be accidental. The emperor clearly liked it.

1, 513. H. with H.N. reads *addunt in spatio* and says 'The Berne scholia explain thus: *propria vox circi, equi enim cursus*

spatio addere dicuntur.' I cannot understand text or comment.

2, 47. H. has *se tollunt in luminis auras*. Surely this merely irritating alteration of a well-known Lucretian phrase is inadmissible.

2, 53. *sterilis, quae stirpibus exit ab imis.* Remove the comma after *sterilis*. The shoot is not 'barren' in itself, but even when overshadowed makes efforts to produce something (line 56). It 'springs barren from the bottom of the trunk' because wanting light and air; plant it out and it will show that it is not barren.

2, 62. *cogendae in sulcum.* C. 'drilled into trenches,' comparing *cogere in ordinem*, but that = 'reduce to the ranks.' *Cogendae* is not used in a military sense here, but marks the strong effort needed, cf. *labor* preceding and *domandae* following.

2, 93. *tenuisque Lageos.* Certainly not 'a thin light wine' as C., but, as Servius, *pene-trabilis quae cito in venas descendit.* A wine which will 'presently try your legs' is not a 'thin light wine.' Perhaps = 'subtle'; it looks light and tastes mild, but beware!

2, 123. *aera vincere summum arboris.* C.'s explanation is perplexing. Is not *aer summus arboris* simply = *summa aeria arbor* 'the heaven-towering tree-top,' which the archer 'conquers' by shooting over it?

2, 187. *huc summis liquuntur rupibus amnes.* 'The sentence gives the reason for the moisture of the land so placed,' C. No, but it gives the reason for its fertility. There is moisture but not stagnation and the rivers bring with them 'fertilising mud.'

2, 192. H. rightly refers to Prof. Robin-son Ellis in Cat. 39, 11, for the 'fat Etrus-can.'

2, 247. *at sapor indicium faciet, manifestus et ora.*

tristia temptantum sensu torquebit amaro

Editors discuss at length the readings *amaro* and *amaror*, but the real interest of the passage is in the imitative character of the second line. Especially if *temptantum* be pronounced strongly, the line clearly mimics the action of a person who has tasted something which he wishes to spit out. Many, of course, will call such a view fanciful, but the occurrence of such a line in a writer with such a sensitive ear as Virgil cannot be accidental. Unfortunately Hyginus discovered *amaror*, and so Virgil's comic line became merely a subject for critical controversy.

C. says '*manifestus* seems plainly to go with *faciet*.' Yet surely it is not the clearness of the taste which Virgil wishes to

bring out, but the clearness of the visible effect on the taster. The comma should undoubtedly be after *faciet*.

2, 279. H. rather boldly doubts whether the arrangement of vines like an army is the arrangement in *quincuncem*, chiefly because 'the exact nature of the manipular system is disputed,' and 'it had certainly vanished before Virgil's time.' Yet Virgil must have had the *quincunx* before his mind, for he clearly has Varro i. chapter 7 before him, as he gives exactly the same reasons for his arrangement as Varro does for the arrangement in *quincuncem*, viz. (1) symmetry, and (2) that it affords the maximum of light and space. As a matter of fact, too, the *quincunx* arrangement is the one which will give each plant most room, as a mathematician demonstrated to me with a number of pennies. Quintilian too refers to the *quincunx* arrangement as combining the greatest beauty with the greatest economy of space.

2, 302 seq. C. explains *insere* = *intersere*, though *intervenire* occurs three lines previously and *inserere* in this Book is regularly = 'engraft.' But the error of his view is shown in 312, where he has '*non a stirpe valent sc. vites*', for the vines are strong from the root and might shoot again, but, if you engrave the olive on the oleaster, the olive after a fire, being burned below the graft, cannot shoot again. For *caesae . . .*, cf. Job xiv. 7.

2, 341. H. rightly reads and supports *terrea*.

2, 350. *halitus.* C. 'probably from the evaporation of the water.' Rather *halitus* is used strictly = 'breath': the plant gets nourishment from the water; then begins to breathe; then 'plucks up spirit' (*animos tollent*).

2, 362. *parcendum teneris.* 'Deal gently with the young.' Surely the 'personification' here and in numberless instances deserves notice.

2, 389. *oscilla mollia.* H. explains 'made of wax or wool.'

2, 499. C.'s remarks, as though the rustic who does not ' pity the poor' showed 'selfish indifference,' are needless. He does not pity the poor simply because there are no poor to pity, as there are no rich to envy.

3, 70. *semper enim refice.* C. has '*Enim*' here seems to be added for emphasis. The words are to be connected with what follows.' This is wrong, as is the remark of Servius that *enim* here has no force, and that of Pierius that it is = *itaque* ('for' = 'therefore'!). ' You will always be needing

visible
d un-
ether
ny is
chiefly
ular
ainly
Virgil
mind,
before
asons
or the
sym-
num
fact,
one
as a
th a
fers
ning
test

sere,
pre-
arly
w is
irpe
ong
but,
the
the
..
orts

the
titus
gets
rins
nos

lly
on'
ves

ade

tic
sel-
not

no

im
he
hat
of
nd
=

ng

to change some of your herd,' says Virgil, 'for (i.e. because) continual renewal is essential to prevent degeneration in a herd.' Instead of writing *semper enim reficienda sunt corpora matrum*, he writes vigorously *semper enim refice*.

3, 76. *et mollia crura reponit*. C. writes 'The meaning of *reponit* is very doubtful.' H. strikes out 'very,' but the meaning is not doubtful at all. The colt picks up his feet clean, and puts them down as though he would not bruise a daisy. C.'s own explanation at the end of his note is right.

3, 82. *color deterrimus albis*. Has any one seen a white race-horse of repute? The 'white horses' of Homer are surely white as being divine, and literary tradition then kept up the phrase 'with white horses' = 'at utmost speed,' in defiance of fact.

3, 82. *duplex spina*. See Liddell and Scott s.v. *δσρφις*.

3, 140. *non illas* needs its force bringing out more clearly.

3, 141. *saltu superare viam*—'to be taken with what follows of clearing, i.e. leaping out of the road.' This is unintelligible to me. What is to 'clear, i.e. leap out of the road'? Surely the phrase is simply = 'gallop' or 'canter' along a road.' Either to ride a mare in foal fast along a road or let it get excited and gallop in the fields is bad.

3, 193. *sitque laboranti similis*. 'So Hor. Od. 2, 3, 11, *obliquo laborat lympha fugax trepidare rivo*, the stream being forced to bend, like the horse here,' C. Surely *laboranti* is not in the least = 'forced to bend,' but describes the horse 'chafing' 'struggling to get his head.' It ought carefully to be brought out in this elaborate passage that the comparison is not merely between the horse and the North Wind, but between the horse first walking soberly, then breaking into faster movement, and finally into a furious gallop, and the N. wind rising by similar steps into a tornado. The whole passage is worked out with the utmost care. Like many other passages in Virgil it needs explaining *simply*. Unfortunately if an Editor writes a clear and simple note every one says 'Oh, that is as plain as a pikestaff,' and the true road to reputation is learned obscurity.

3, 217. *dulcibus illa quidem illecebris*. C. gives '*illa quidem* having the force of *quamvis*, "she wastes them away, though with a tender passion.'" The use of *ille quidem* practically = *quamvis* is well known, but surely here it is a strengthened form of *ille* pleonastic, used to draw marked attention

to the subject—'she does not allow them to remember groves or pastures as she stands, look you! in her sweet witchery.' The sight of groves and pastures is alluring, but when they look at her it is forgotten. Cf. l. 500 *sudor, et ille quidem moriturus frigidus* 'sweat, aye and, mark you, when death approaches a cold sweat,' where C. says 'compare 217' but the explanation of *ille quidem* = *quamvis* cannot hold.

3, 267. *saxa per et scopulos et depressas convales* Professor Robinson Ellis on Cat. 65, 23, says that 'the interruption of the dactylic movement by a spondaic rhythm expresses a sudden check...The rapid flight is arrested, and after a time becomes slower.' Surely this is not so here. The opening dactyls express the leaps and bounds of the animals over 'boulders and rocks,' the balanced spondees of *depressas convales* mark their smooth even gallop along the valley. Conington seems to agree in this view.

3, 400-403. Notes on cheese admirably re-written by H.

3, 518. Seller's admirable illustration of *fraterna morte* from Georges Sand must be inserted in every comment. It is worth sheets of ordinary notes.

4, 39. *foco et floribus*. H. rightly not 'pollen' but 'propolis'; an important point.

4, 74. *spiculaque exacuant rostris*. Must be 'sharpen their stings with' or 'against their beaks.' This is of course inaccurate, but H. notes Sidgwick's remark that bees rubbing their bodies with their legs to remove dirt may be the origin of the error. The same suggestion was made to me independently by a scientific friend to whom I applied.

4, 85. *usque adeo obnizi non cedere, dum gravis aut hos | aut hos versa fuga victor dare terga subegit*. C. notes "we might have expected *subegerit*, and Kennedy regards *subegit* as = *subegerit* by Syncope. No doubt where the sense of *purpose* is clear *dum* would be followed by a subjunctive, but *obnizus* does not describe purpose so much as the actual attitude of a warrior who plants his feet and will not budge (Livy, 6, 12, 8 *obnizos stabili gradu hostium impetum excipere*), and Virgil simply records the fact that the leaders do so hold their ground. So too H.

4, 86-87. *hi motus animorum...* 'Here Virgil's humour breaks out, relieving what would otherwise be mere exaggeration,' C. The humour is obvious, but what about the pathos? Remembering what *pulveris exigui tactu* must suggest to a Roman ear (cf Hor.

Od., 1, 28, 35 *iniecta ter pulvere*), and how Virgil, throughout the *Georgics*, loves to use phrases which may be taken first literally and secondly with a deeper human meaning, I cannot believe that he wrote these wonderful lines without some thought of the 'passions and rivalries' of human life, which are all laid to rest for ever 'with the flinging of a little dust.' True, Varro and Pliny prescribe this 'flinging of dust' with absolutely no secondary meaning, but they were not poets.

4, 2. H. rightly notes that Virgil is describing two sorts of bees, the common brown bee and the Ligurian.

4, 153. *consortia tecta | urbis habent* 'hold dwellings in common'; so H. also. C. had 'have dwellings united into a city.'

4, 170 seq. C. has a long note on the disputed point whether this famous comparison is an exaggeration. Of course it is; Virgil himself notes the fact line 176; it is exactly in his power to describe these tiny creatures in heroic verse that the poet finds his pleasure and pride. Is not Shakespeare's famous description of bees exaggeration? Is not 'the tent-royal of their emperor' an exaggerated phrase? Doubtless it is kind of Pope and Heyne (not Heine) to defend Virgil here, but their defence is not needed.

4, 227. *angustam*. It should be clearly shown that this reading and *ora fave* 230 stand or fall together. The reading *angustam...ore fave* ('Pour approcher de la demeure auguste des abeilles il faut s'être purifié et garder le silence,' Benoist) is so good that it cannot be neglected, and perhaps there is no passage in the classics where such slight textual alteration produces two such excellent readings. For myself I do not see much point in *angustam*, and prefer the humorous dignity of *angustam...ore fave*.

4, 244. *immunis*. 'The drones have not performed their *munus* of labour,' C. Surely the word is = *ἀσύμβολος*; the drones sat at a feast provided by others without 'paying their shot.'

4, 250. H. gives *foros* = 'passages,' probably rightly; not 'rows of cells' as C.

4, 337. *caeseriem effusae*. H. retains C.'s note on this construction, and adds H. N.'s note at the end of it. This is very confusing. Surely no one doubts the active (or middle) force of the participle in these cases; in an Appendix to my edition of *Aen.* 1-6 I collect the instances in those books, and when printed together they seem irresistible.

4, 455. H. rightly prints *ad meritum*. Nothing else will put this passage straight.

T. E. PAGE.

PAGE'S EDITION OF THE *BUCOLICS* AND *GEORGICS*.

P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica, with introduction and notes by T. E. PAGE, M.A. Macmillan (Classical Series), 1898. Pp. xl., 386. 5s.

MR. PAGE sets out to rescue the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* from the unmerited oblivion into which they have fallen at our public schools. The editor is worthy of the task, and the task itself is a worthy one, if it really be the fact that 'young students seem now to limit their reading of Virgil chiefly to the *Aeneid*, while his other writings are comparatively neglected.' There are indeed some who think that Virgil is too subtle, too fine, too difficult, to be of the slightest educational value to any but the very best sixth form boys: and personally I confess to believing that the best fate that could befall the poet himself and the public school boy, is that Virgil should be banished from our class-rooms for a century. But if he is to be read, then by all means let the *Georgics* be read at least as much as, if not more than, the *Aeneid*. For in them the poet writes always from his heart; and if his agriculture

is somewhat remote from our own (Mr. Page, by the way, takes occasion to point out that in one respect at least he was in advance of all events the eighteenth century, p. xxxvii.), it is not more remote from reality than is his fighting: and if the school-boy learns any moral lesson at all from what he reads it is better that he should learn to admire the glory of labour than the tinsel of mock chivalry.

In the introduction Mr. Page gives an able and fairly concise appreciation of Virgil as a writer on the country, but I cannot help thinking that his 293 pages of notes are somewhat excessive in quantity. He most admirably illustrates Virgil from Virgil, but very often at extreme length, and while he seems to feel (alas, very rightly) that the average school-master will in all probability teach his boys too little, he himself is apt to try to teach them too much. The notes, too, are overburdened with translations, often of a most superfluous nature (e.g. 'rudentes' "bellowing" or "belling," 'cae-dunt' "slay," 'reges' "kings"), which, from an educational point of view are simply

disastrous. The subject matter is always well, if too fully, treated (the note on the plough G. i. 170, in particular, is excellent), and, as might be expected from the introduction, the literary side of the poems receives due attention. Yet, in spite of its fulness, the book has all that amateurishness (if Mr. Page will allow me to use the word) which characterised his brilliant edition of the *Odes* of Horace: with this difference, that what was only an amiable failing in 1883 has become a serious defect in 1898. This edition is, indeed, absolutely uncritical. It is true that at the foot of nearly every page of the text there are printed one or two Latin words which, from one's previous knowledge of the subject, one is aware are variant readings. But not only in nine cases out of ten is there not a single word of explanation of them in the notes: but emendations and MSS. variants are mixed up without distinction. For example *Ecl.* vi. 33 on the word *exordia*, there is a foot-note '33 ex omnia; ex ordia' i.e. the reading of P, and an emendation of Nettleship's; and the commentary contains this remark 'For *exordia* some MSS. give *ex omnia*: if so cf. the order of words in line 19.' We hear vaguely of MSS. from time to time; but they are never enumerated or described, and no attempt is ever made to discriminate between them: thus in *Ecl.* iv. 53 where he reads *tam* with a few libri deteriores, his note simply says 'many MSS. read *tum*', the 'many' being PRyabe; and again on *Ecl.* i. 65, where he rightly reads *rapidum cretae*, he makes the most misleading remark 'there seems about equal authority for reading *Cretae*.' What kind of 'authority'? Such defects as these should be remedied in a second edition, and either the 'critical notes' be removed altogether, or else remodelled in such a way as to stimulate instead of deadening the youthful reader's critical instincts.

In respect of orthography Mr. Page is so far in advance of some of his predecessors that he has attained a fairly complete degree of uniformity. Often, no doubt, at the expense of truth, e.g. in the case of the acc. plur. in -es, where one could wish that he had followed the rough rules as given by Brambach. But, what is of chief importance in a school-book, having chosen one form he adheres to it (*laurus* and *lauros* is the only exception I have found), and will have nothing to say to those who uphold the theory that an editor should follow the spelling of the pro tempore best MS.—a theory which is particularly futile in the case of Virgil owing to the fragmentary state of the older

MSS. Orthography is a branch of philology which is unduly neglected at schools, and which must sooner or later be forced upon the attention of the school-master. The difficulty is, of course, to find a standard: when the Romans themselves disagreed, who shall decide? Brambach's system is well-known to all scholars, and has been in the main followed by our standard Latin dictionary. There is a good deal that may be said against it, but still it is a system, and something would be gained if its adoption for all authors later than Lucretius could be made more general. The Clarendon Press now have an opportunity of doing something of the kind in the series of classical texts which they are about to produce. These texts should have a very wide circulation in this country, and I appeal to the Press not to allow this opportunity of improving the standard of orthography to pass unused. The principles on which they might work are, it seems to me, these. First, that there is not sufficient evidence to fix in all its details the spelling of any particular author. Second, that, this being so, some authority—Brambach, or any one better who can be found—should be prescribed, whom, where he speaks decisively, all the editors should follow; while, in cases where two forms were equally in use (e.g. *urbes* and *urbis*), some sort of agreement should be arrived at between the editors as to which should prevail. Third, that whether or not such a general agreement is arrived at, there should be absolute uniformity within the limits of each particular author. Aulus Gellius—whose work possesses about the critical value of Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature*—may tell us that Virgil wrote *tris* in one line and *tres* in the next, following his own ear rather than the rules of the grammarians. Our nineteenth century editor has not Virgil's ear, and he should be content to take one thing and stick to it. The uniformity arrived at by the observance of these principles will no doubt be arbitrary, and the discovery of further evidence may at any moment prove it to be entirely wrong. The editor of school texts, however, is working not for eternity, but for time; and at the present time we have no system of orthography—nothing that can be taught—at all. But as truth emerges more easily from error than from confusion, such uniformity, however arbitrary and erroneous in detail, is, I believe, at least a step in the right direction.

F. A. HIRTZEL.

VOLLMER'S STATIUS' *SILVAE*.

P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri, herausgegeben und erklärt von FRIEDRICH VOLLMER. Leipzig, Teubner. 1898. 16 Mk.

We have to thank Herr Teubner, perhaps the greatest benefactor of classical scholarship in our century, for this new Statius, which will certainly supply a long felt want. The editor, Vollmer, is favourably known by a tract on *laudationes funebres*. Students of the *Silvae* have hitherto had to rest content with Markland, where criticism is the strongest feature, or the four-volume edition of our author published in London a century ago, which however pleasant to the use is behindhand now, especially in the department of history and antiquities. Editions of single *Silvae* have indeed been published from time to time during the present century as doctor's dissertations, &c., but it is obvious that a complete collection of such cannot take the place of a harmonious commentary to the whole.

The book opens with an Introduction (pp. 1-52) dealing with (1) Statius' Life and Works, (2) Appreciation and History of the *Silvae*, including an account of the MSS. by Moritz Krohn of Zittau, who is to bring out the new text of the *Silvae* in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana. The former contains a valuable chronology of the several *Silvae* and also of the collected books, and will prove very useful alongside of Friedländer's treatment of the same subject in the *Sittengeschichte*, vol. iii. In the second chapter the speed with which the poems were written is rightly insisted on, and many scholars have been guilty both of shortsighted criticism and waste of time in the attempt to construct finished poems from the text we have. The later authors who have alluded to or imitated Statius are next enumerated. It appears (p. 34) that with the sixth century knowledge of the poems disappears, and it is not till the discovery of a codex by Poggio that we hear of them again. This codex has unfortunately been lost, and the readings of it which are written in a copy of the *editio princeps* (now in the Corsinian Library at Rome) are not so numerous as we should like. The best extant witness to the text is the codex Matritensis (saecc. xv., Bibl. Nazion. M. 31), which has bound up with it, among other works, the poem of Manilius. Of the latter Prof. Robinson Ellis has given a collation in the *Classical Review* (vols. vii. and

viii., 1893, 1894), but a complete collation of the *Silvae* is yet unpublished, and for this we must wait till the edition of Krohn appears, unless some one anticipate him. Those who know the *Silvae* best will be least likely to quarrel with the statement (p. 36, repeated p. 37) 'Gronovs recensio ist die beste, die wir haben'; the Teubner text of Baehrens is exceedingly careless, disfigured by more than his usual number of useless conjectures, the MS. reading having to be restored sometimes as often as six times on one page. Then comes an Appendix on 'The Wars of Domitian.' It is unfortunate that the editor had not seen Gsell's excellent monograph till this was written.

The text follows (pp. 55-202), and beneath it are printed select various readings, and also passages echoed by and imitated from the *Silvae*. A good deal has been done already for the imitations, for example, by Peiper's Ausonius, Lütjohann's Sidonius, and Birt's Claudian. The text is mainly and rightly conservative. We shall confine ourselves to a few remarks of approval or disapproval of the treatment of selected passages, letting it be fully understood that we believe this to be the very best text of the poems yet published. i. 1, 1: *geminata* Vollmer and vulg. This is a very slight alteration of MSS. *gemmaata*, which I would keep. Cf. lucem coruscam (v. 71) and the general expression in Gsell 127 that the architecture of the period showed 'un goût exagéré pour les matériaux précieux, la surcharge de l'ornementation.' i. 1, 25: MSS. *discit et* should be kept with Skutsch, who styles *discitur* a worthless conjecture. i. 2, 202: the conjecture *coepitque labores* was also made by Macnaghten (*Journ. of Philol.* 19, 130). i. 5, 39: the editor has given up his former conjecture *quasque Tyros niveas* and now reads *cumque Tyri niveas*. i. 6 is the most difficult, and perhaps the most interesting of all the poems. The editor has given up line 8 (*laeti Caesaris ebriamque *parten*) and line 15 (*et quo percoquit *aebosia cannos*) in despair. In no poem are the defects of our MSS. more conspicuous, and long pondering over it but serves to make its readings more mysterious. In line 17 the editor keeps *gaioli* in the sense of 'gebackene Männlein,' and probably this is allowable, though no parallel is produced. The ordinary reading *molles caseoli* is however powerfully supported by Plaut. *Capt.* 851 *mollem caseum*, and L.

Pomponius Bononiensis, v. 62 (Ribbeck, *com. fr. ed. 3*) *caseum molle*. The editor has omitted to mention that line 38 is a reminiscence of Lucan vii. 411 *hunc uoluit (Roma) nescire diem* (the day of Pharsalus). On ii. 5, 9 it should have been stated that the line is from Verg. IX. 553 (*fera*) *saltu supra ue nabula fertur*.

The commentary fills pp. 207-560, and is preceded by two and a half important pages of bibliography, where the editor might have included the convenient monograph of P. Rasi, *De L. Arruntio Stella poeta Patavino* (Patavii, 1890). We have nothing but praise for this lengthy and valuable commentary, including, as it does, notes from Bücheler, to whom the book is worthily dedicated, and employing the full resources of an up-to-date and splendidly equipped classical library. If we might single out one feature more than another, it would be the large number of passages in the neglected *Thebais* and *Achilleis*, which are referred to in illustration of usage. This will be found useful even by those who possess the splendid *index uerborum* which

constitutes the fourth volume in Lemaire's edition. It is pleasant to find a number of references in the notes to Prof. Mayor's *Juvenal*. The name *Violentilla* is rightly derived from *violentus* (p. 237); Martial was wrong in dubbing her *'Iarbis' (iola)*. At the end of the notes is an appendix 'Prosodisches und Metrisches.' Pp. 561-598 embrace the two excellent indexes made by H. Saftien, the first, one of proper names, which will save the reader the trouble of turning to the anonymous index at the end of Kohlmann's *Thebais*, and the second, an index to the introduction and commentary, which we venture to prophesy will be found serviceable in the study of other silver authors. This edition is to be cordially recommended to British and American scholars, and may encourage some new readers to approach the *Silvae*, the matter of which is of considerable importance, even though their style be careless and excessively allusive.

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen.

THE 'THOUGHTS' OF M. AURELIUS.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself. An English translation with Introductory Study on Stoicism and the Last of the Stoics. By G. H. RENDALL, M.A., Litt.D. Macmillan. 1898. 6s.

LOVERS of the latest and most lovable of Stoics will welcome this translation as a worthy rendering of their favourite author. The translator is in thorough sympathy with his subject; he is well equipped, as is shown in the Introduction, with the learning which is required for understanding him; and he is moreover master of an English style which, in its grave and quiet beauty, reflects back the tone of thought of Aurelius far better than his own perplexed and crabbed Greek. Take the following specimens, two from the Introduction, and two from the Translation.

'On first perusal the "Thoughts" probably seem too highly moralised to be entirely sincere or interesting as a self-revelation. They create an impression of formality, of reticence and schooled decorum resulting from habitual self-restraint... Feeling and passion are hushed in principles and maxims, until the record of personal experience

becomes upon the surface impersonal and colourless. But as tone and manner grow familiar, the individuality of the writer becomes distinct, intense, and unmistakable. Self-repression does not obliterate the lines of personality, but unifies and in a manner augments their effect; and the thoughts "To Himself" become the one authentic testimony and record of philosophy upon the throne... Behind the mask of monarchy the man's lineaments are disclosed; we overhear the wistful affections and the lone regrets, the sense of personal shortcoming and wasted endeavour, the bitterness of aspirations baffled and protests unheeded, the confessions of despondency and sometimes of disgust, we realise the exhausting tedium of "life at Court lived well," the profound ennui of autocracy in its enforced companionship with intrigue and meanness and malice and self-seeking, the stern demands of duty hampered by power and realised in renunciation, the pride and patience, the weakness and the strength, the busy loneliness, the mournful serenity, the daily death in life of the Imperial sage' (p. cxiii. f.).

'The impressive pathos, which attaches to this convinced presentiment of death, is more than personal. The funeral notes, which culminate in the *Nunc Dimitiss* of the closing book, are the knell of a dying age. Over the tomb of Marcus, too, the historian might fitly inscribe the mournful epitaph *Last of his Line.* Last of Roman Stoics, he is also the last of Emperors in whom the ancient stock of Roman virtue survived. He stood, but half unconsciously, at the outgoing of an age, filled with a sense of transitoriness in all things human, of epochs,

'empires, dynasties as well as individuals passing to dust and oblivion. The gloom of decadence haunted and oppressed him' (p. cxliii. f.).

'Constantly realize how many physicians are dead, who have often enough knit their brows over their patients; how many astrologers, who have pompously predicted others' deaths; philosophers, who have held disquisitions without end on death or immortality; mighty men, who have slain their thousands; tyrants, who in exercise of their prerogative of death have blustered as though they were immortals; whole cities buried bodily . . . Then, count up those whom you have known, one by one; how one buried another, was in turn laid low, and another buried him; and all this in a little span. In a word, look at all human things, behold how fleeting and how sorry—but yesterday a mucus-clot, to-morrow dust or ashes. Spend your brief moment then according to nature's law, and serenely greet the journey's end, as an olive falls when it is ripe, blessing the branch that bare it and giving thanks to the tree that gave it life' (iv. 48).

'Say, men kill you, quarter you, pursue you with execrations: what has that to do with your understanding remaining pure, lucid, temperate, just? It is as though a man stood beside some sweet transparent fountain, abusing it, and it ceased not to well forth draughts of pure water; nay, though he cast in mud and filth, it will speedily disperse them and wash them forth and take no stain. How then can you create a living fountain within? Imbue yourself in freedom every hour, with charity, simplicity and self-respect' (viii. 51).

Of course, we here and there come across a sentence which falls below this high level. In viii. 36 for instance (where we are warned against magnifying present evil by thinking of the past or the future), I prefer Collier's paraphrase 'This is strangely lessened, if you take it singly and by itself. Chide your fancy, therefore, if it offers to shrink for a moment and grow faint under so slender a trial' to Rendall's more exact but less natural rendering 'Even that you minimise, when you strictly circumscribe it to itself and repudiate moral inability to hold out merely against that.' Once or twice I have noticed what seemed to be inaccuracies. Thus in i. 7 περισπά τί σε τὰ ἔξωθεν ἐμπίποτα· σχολήν πάρεχε σταυτῷ τὸν προσγανθόντα ἀγαθόν τι, καὶ πάντα ρεμβόμενος. Long rightly takes the infinitival genitive as expressing purpose, 'Give thyself time to learn something new and good,' while R. has 'give yourself some respite from the taskwork of new good.' In iii. 1 διαπνεῖσθαι is translated 'respiration' by R., but more correctly 'perspiration' by Long after Gataker. In iii. 2 τοῖς ἑαντοῖς σώφροσιν ὁφθαλμοῖς seems to me better expressed in Collier's 'with chastened eyes he will find beauty in the ripeness of age as well as in the blossom of youth,' than in R.'s 'the old woman and the old man will have an ideal

loveliness, as youth its ravishing charm, made visible to *eyes that have the skill*.' In vii. 12 'Upright or uprighted' is an unsatisfactory rendering of ὅρθος η ὅρθονύμενος even if we consider the stress to be laid on the voice (as is done by all the interpreters) and not on the tense, as I should prefer, translating 'upright or in course of becoming upright.' No doubt in iii. 5 where the same phrase occurs, ὅρθονύμενος is distinctly passive, contrasting the man who is upheld from without with the man of inner rectitude, but the meaning there is determined by the context: where it stands absolutely, I think we may give it a more natural sense. If however we are bound to adhere to the same sense in both passages, I should prefer to give η the force of 'than' here, *Self-upheld rather than upheld from without*.

At the end of the volume we have a selection of emendations, some of the best of which are by the translator himself. Such is ii. 6 ὑβρίζη; <μὴ> ὑβρίζε σταυτήν, ωψυχή τοῦ δὲ τιμῆσαι σταυτήν οὐκέτι καιρὸν ἔχει. εἰς γάρ δέ βίος ἔκαστον, where the old text is ὑβρίζε, ὑβρίζε αὐτήν and either εἰς γάρ or οὐ γάρ. i. 16 In the list of good things received from his father Marcus includes τὸ ζητητικὸν...καὶ ἐπίμονον, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ προσαπέστη, where Gataker could suggest nothing better than ἀλλ' οὐτοῦ πρ. R. has ἐπίμονον ὥν ἄν δόλος τις προσαπέστη. Another happy restoration is in iii. 4 τὶ γάρ ἀλλον ἔργον στέρησι τως ἔτι φανταζόμενος for the impossible οὐτοι γάρ...τοντέστι φαντ. Is there any reason for altering ἀγαγούσκειν in viii. 8? Marcus often speaks of the sacrifice he had made in discontinuing his studies (cf. ii. 2, 3); so here he says 'to read is forbidden you, but it is not forbidden to put in practice your philosophy.' In iv. 18 οὔσην ἀσχολίαν κερδαίνει ὁ μῆ βλέπων τί ὁ πληρόν εἶτε R. adopts Gataker's ενσχολίαν, on the ground, as he tells us in *J. of Ph.* vol. 23, p. 133, that he can find no authority for κερδαίνειν meaning 'to save.' Is not the following from Heliodorus (*Aeth.* 4, 10) a case in point, ἔσον με σωπῶσαν δυστυχεῖν καὶ τὴν γοῦν αἰσχύνην κερδαίνειν, κρύπτονταν ἀ καὶ πάσχειν αἰσχρόν?

Since the above was written, I have come across another instance of this use of κερδαίνειν in *Aeth.* viii. 8, where it is said that the murderous attack on Chariclea will save her from the guilt of suicide, κερδάσσει τὸ ἐναγές τῆς πράξεως, ὃ καθ' ἑαντῆς ἐγνώκει τοιεῦν ἔτερων τοῦτο δρασάντων.

J. B. MAYOR.

TWO RECENT MUNICH DISSERTATIONS.

THE University of Munich has been so prominent in other lines of work, especially in archaeology, that the unusual advantages which it offers for investigation in philology (using the term in its narrower sense) have only recently come to be appreciated by English-speaking students.

The two dissertations which are briefly reviewed below are both dedicated to Professor Wölfflin, and each was awarded the unusual honor of a *summa cum laude*. The current view of the last forty years has been, that there were two Roman writers by the name of Julius Firmicus Maternus; in other words, that the *De Errorre Profanarum Religionum* and the *Mathesos libri VIII* were the work of different hands. The fifth edition of Teuffel-Schwabe's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, for example, denies explicitly the identity of 'Der Heide' and 'Der Christ.' The opposite view has not been without supporters, and has recently found champions in the two Breslau scholars, Kroll and Skutsch.

Professor Moore first reviews the chronological difficulties which were supposed to stand in the way of the identification, but were finally disposed of by Mommsen in vol. 29 of *Hermes*. He then considers the question from the only point of view which can lead to convincing conclusions, namely the similarity of the two treatises in language and in style. The result is not only to prove the writer's main contention, and to establish to the satisfaction of the most sceptical reader the identity of 'the heathen' and 'the Christian'; but the collection as well of a great deal of interesting and valuable lexicographical and semasiological material.

A second chapter discusses 'Quellen und Litteratur Kenntniss.' This part of the work is in the main carefully and thoroughly done, but as might be expected from the nature of the subject, is less convincing than the preceding chapter in some of its details. Dr. Moore believes that in the *De Errorre* Firmicus made use of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix, and that he consulted the *Euhemerus* of Ennius in the

¹ *Iulius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ*, von Clifford H. Moore, Inaug. Diss. Munich, 1897; *Die Quellen contamination im 21 und 22 Buche des Livius*, von Henry A. Sanders. Inaug. Diss. Munich, 1897. Published by Mayer and Müller, Berlin.

form of a prose paraphrase. In the *Mathesis* he notices interesting parallels with Manilius and with others of the Roman poets. The Sulla-episode is given in full, with critical notes, and the view is expressed, against Vogel and Maurenbrecher, that Livy, or more properly speaking the lost Epitome of Livy, was the source followed, rather than Sallust.

Dr. Sanders' dissertation forms the first part of a larger work on the same subject, which is announced by Mayer and Müller for 1898. It deals with the difficult question of Livy's use of his sources, a subject much discussed, as is shown by the three pages of bibliography which Dr. Sanders cites. The current views are summarized as follows: (1) Livy in his 21st. and 22nd. books followed Polybius directly; (2) Livy made no use of Polybius at all; (3) Livy used Polybius indirectly, that is, through the medium of some historian who himself followed Polybius. Nissen, an adherent of the second view, maintained that Livy in the fourth and fifth decades of his work followed but one authority, whom he merely translated. This notion, that the historian was a mere 'Copie-maschine,' was applied by other investigators to the third decade as well, and is held responsible by Dr. Sanders for the lack of success which he believes has attended those who have previously discussed the question. In a long digression he describes the methods which the Romans followed in book-making in general, and particularly in the writing of history. He quotes a number of interesting passages, of which Pliny's account of his uncle's method of work, detailed in Ep. 3, 5, and Cicero's request to Luceius (*ad Fam.* 5, 12) may especially be mentioned. He finds that the collecting of excerpts as a preliminary to composition was in general use, and that the material thus gathered was used with considerable freedom, the writer not infrequently depending on his memory rather than on his notes. The difficulty of following one authority and checking him by consulting secondary sources at various points in the work is shown, and the conclusion reached that this was not done. Only in the late and degenerate times did the custom of transcribing a single source prevail. For the earlier times the example of Silius Italicus is quoted, who drew on

Ennius, Livy, and various of the annalists for his historical information.

After this General Introduction the writer postpones his principal subject of investigation, to discuss the lost Epitome of Livy's history and its use by other writers who treat the second Punic war. In a series of discussions, illustrated by parallel passages which cannot here be given in detail, he shows that the Epitome was used by Orosius, Eutropius, the Pseudo-Victor, Florus, Quintilian, Firmicus Maternus, Lucan, Seneca, Appian, and Valerius Maximus. He thus places the date of its composition earlier than 30 A.D., but for

stylistic reasons does not regard it as made by Livy himself. He believes that the Epitome was a school book and a reading book, composed by an educated man with rhetorical training, who made numerous additions and changes, just as Julius Paris did in his Epitome of Valerius Maximus. The work was therefore known by the general title of *Historia Romana*, and is so cited, for example, by Hieronymus.

The second part of the work, as yet unpublished, will treat of Livy's use of his sources, and will be awaited with interest.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

University of Michigan.

EDITION OF FIRMICUS BY KROLL AND SKUTSCH.

Julii Firmici Materni Matheseos Libri VIII.
Ediderunt W. KROLL et F. SKUTSCH. Fasiculus Prior, Libros IV priores et quinti Prooemium continens. Lipsiae, in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MDCCXCVII. 4m.

It is remarkable that, after Firmicus had been for a very long time neglected, two editions of his first four books should have appeared within the last four years. In neither case do the editors seem to have been affected by that modern interest in occult learning which, in England at least, is bringing astrology once more into fashion; but it is clear that in the present case care has been taken to compare Firmicus with what survives of other ancient astrological writers; and perhaps, when the work is complete, we may find that light has been thrown on some of the obscure questions connected with the origin of the science. In the way of criticism not much can be attempted as yet, since the editors have reserved their 'preface' till the second volume shall appear, and ask that till then judgment may be suspended even upon their emendations of the text. They have, however, given us, in the way of introduction, an enumeration of the MSS. they have examined, of which Sittl treated somewhat more fully in his edition of 1894. The points to be noticed are, first, that of the eight books of Firmicus the older and better MSS. contain only the first four—and even those not completely—and, secondly, that the early editors were so liberal of conjecture, and so enterprising in the filling up of gaps as to have prepared occasional pitfalls for subsequent generations of scholars. Thus

the dictionaries give 'spadicarius, one who dyes a chestnut-brown colour,' on the authority of Firmicus, in whose work no such word really occurs. For purposes of reference it is a misfortune, though an inevitable one, that the old division into chapters and sections cannot be maintained; indeed the present edition and that of Sittl differ considerably. Of points of interest brought out by the new editions two may be noticed: the first, that in the list of the 36 'decans' given in the fourth book, several of what we know to have been the ancient Egyptian names are plainly recognisable in the new text, which had been hopelessly disguised in the old. The second places the erudition of Prof. Mommsen in a light of what seems to me almost supernatural brilliancy. In the second book is given the horoscope of a person whom Firmicus will not name, but whose honours and misfortunes he enumerates, ending with the remark that Lollianus, to whom his work is addressed, will know very well who is meant. It has been supposed, rather oddly that this person is Lollianus himself, and Sittl pointed out that, if so, this part of the book was written later than the rest, since Lollianus was not consul, as was the hero of the horoscope, until some time after the death of Constantine, to whom Firmicus often refers as emperor. But Professor Mommsen's acquaintance with the people of that age enables him to show clearly that the horoscope is that of Ceionius Rufius Albinus, consul in 335, exactly at the time required by the internal evidence. This is certainly a triumph of scholarship.

E. J. WEBB.

LEO ON THE PLAUTINE CANTICA.

Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik, by F. LEO (Berlin, Weidmann, 1897). M. 7.50.

THE present treatise is the first attempt to consider the metrical constitution of the Plautine cantica in the light of recent discoveries in the field of Hellenistic verse ; and it will be studied by students of Plautus as breaking new ground and raising, if not solving, problems with which every future editor will have to reckon. At the same time it is a valuable supplement to the author's edition of Plautus, which does not contain an account of the metres.

Ever since 1896, when Mr. Grenfell published the Alexandrian erotic fragment, the date of which appears to be about the same as that of the death of Plautus, the question has been mooted how far we have in it a specimen of the kind of verse on which the Plautine cantica may have been based. A certain similarity between the two was noticed by Crusius in his review of the fragment in the *Philologus*.¹ A wide field of enquiry is thus opened up, the problem being to trace the relation between the lyrical measures of Plautus and Greek dramatic lyrics, as developed between the time of Euripides and the 2nd Century, B.C. ; and this enquiry has an important bearing not only upon the question of Plautus's originality as an artist in metre, but also upon the reconstitution of the Plautine cantica themselves.

To this problem Leo now addresses himself with characteristic boldness and ingenuity, and all students of Plautus will be grateful to him for the important light which he throws on the matter. But the difficulties of the problem are enormous. Neither term of the comparison is fully known ; and one of them is only just emerging from the total obscurity in which it has lain up to the present time. What may not the next few years bring forth in the way of new discoveries, which may throw wholly unexpected light upon Hellenistic verse ?

The difficulty as to the other term of the comparison is illustrated by the fact that Leo has to begin by an elaborate examination of the cantica of Plautus themselves, in order to determine first of all what metres he employed and how they should be regarded and arranged. As every editor of Plautus

knows, this is a question by no means solved, and every page of this treatise bristles with problems and possibilities of error. It has been the practice of the most scientific editors to accept as a rough basis of operations the division into lines and *cola* exhibited in the best MSS. and to scan them as best they may, acquiescing in any heterogeneity of metres to which they may thereby be forced, while at the same time attempting to reduce the many to one, so far as was possible by way of reasonable emendations and redivision of lines. Leo holds that the 'Kolometrie' of the MSS. did not originate with Plautus himself, and it cannot do more than give us a basis of departure in the work of reconstruction. It is obvious that in such a modus operandi there is plenty of room for differences of opinion, even within the pale of strictly scientific procedure : and Leo would be the first to admit that his constructions are not the only possibilities.

Still it must be confessed that the result at which Leo arrives is one which has much to commend it. Hitherto it has been supposed that the polymetry of the cantica—'mixed multitude' or 'buntes Gemisch,' as it has been called by some editors—is a distinctively Roman creation, due to Plautus himself, whereas the other metres of his plays are due to his originals. In opposition to this Leo maintains that the Plautine lyrics are the last outcome of a long process of development which began with the monodies of Euripides, and in which the erotic fragment of Mr. Grenfell is to be regarded as the missing link.² Plautus is then neither an originator of an entirely new departure in this field, nor a mere adapter of existing metrical material, but rather the continuer of a certain line of development. His contribution to the process was similar in kind and extent to that made by some of his predecessors, whose claims to be regarded as original creators is generally admitted ; that is to say, he was original in so far as he isolated a type which he found in sporadic use before his time, and employed it in successive lines for the composition of ὅλα ἄστματα. Leo thus builds a bridge from

¹ Vol. 55, pp. 353-384.

² Leo scans this according to the scheme of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who makes it mainly dochmiae throughout. It is to be noted that dochmiae do not appear in Plautus, as Leo himself admits.

Euripides to Plautus: and even though further research may show that some of the piers do not rest on a very secure foundation, the general result of his enquiry seems likely to be established.

From one point of view the upshot of this treatise is disappointing. Little or nothing is here done to reduce the apparently fortuitous concourse of metrical atoms to order and unity. Indeed, the general tendency of Leo's procedure does not seem to lie in that direction. But it would be premature to pronounce finally on this point until the continuation of the treatise (promised on p. 112) is forthcoming. Meanwhile, however, I confess that I am not satisfied with his treatment of the cola

commonly called trochaic (*e.g.* - _ _ _) and the colon - _ _ _ , frequently found in connexion with cretic verses. Leo contents himself with maintaining that they are of 'cretic character' or a 'constituent part (*Bestandtheil*) of cretic verse.' But this does not enable us to see a unity, unless we are told how the apparent trochaics can be reduced to cretics, or (it might be suggested) the apparent cretics to trochaics. I am far from intending to imply that such a reduction is impossible; but Leo has not given it, and perhaps was precluded from giving it by his antagonism to the 'rhythematic' school of Westphalia.

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

BENNETT'S *DE SENECTUTE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute.
With notes by CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Professor of Latin in Cornell University.
Boston : Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn.
1897. Pp. viii. + 129. Sixty cents.

PROFESSOR BENNETT has given us an edition of the *De Senectute* that is admirable for its brevity and conciseness. In an introduction of but four pages he tells the essential facts about the Dialogue. In the commentary his aim is to give only such information as the student needs in order to understand the text. Most of his comments have to do with questions of language-interpretation and are unusually clear. We should be glad, however, for more references to the grammar in a book intended for comparatively elementary students.

With most of the syntactical notes it is easy to agree, although in a few cases a different explanation might be preferred. Reid's suggestion on *cui qui pareat* (i. 2, 7) brings out the thought better: *unde discerem* (iv. 12, 20) is characteristic rather than purpose; the mood of *scandant* (vi. 17, 19) is subjunctive regardless of the indirect discourse; the note on *quicquid agas* (ix. 27, 11) is inadequate, and the statement that many editors explain *serendis* (vii. 24, 30) as an ablative absolute is rather non-committal. Among many interpretations that deserve to be commended, that of *quid est enim* (ii. 5, 20) seems particularly happy, and the note on *cum...fuisset* (vi. 16, 13) which is founded on the classification laid

down by Professor Hale in his 'Cum-constructions' (pp. 184—189, American Edition), is a model of clearness and completeness.

We are disappointed at the scarcity of literary comment and should welcome references to Latin and English literature, since the *De Senectute* so readily lends itself to this sort of comparison. To make room for such references we could well dispense with the too frequent translations found in the notes. Sentimental Tommy's search for 'hantle' must not be made too easy or he loses the desired training.

The absence of quantity-marks over the long vowels and the relegation of the running English analysis to the commentary, where it properly belongs, leave nothing to mar the beauty of the text page. The loss of a hyphen at the end of line 21, p. 28, is the only error in printing that has been noticed. *Fuissem* (p. 121, line 9) is doubtless a mistake in quotation for *essem*.

The text is mainly that of Mueller, but the critical material which has appeared since 1879 has been utilised and Bennett's text differs from Mueller's in about fifty places. Bennett's own contribution is *exerceri videbamus* for *mori videbamus* (xiv. 49, 18). Most editors simply omit *mori*, although a few defend it. Some conjectures accepted are; Lachmann's *noemum* for *non enim* (iv. 10, 25), Bernay's *plusque* for *postque* (iv. 10, 26), Ribbeck's *Lupo* for *ludo* (vi. 20, 19), Reid's *quoniam* for *cum* (xix. 68, 22), Bergk's *dacrumis* for *lacrumis* (xx. 73, 19).

In vi. 17, 21 the text is improved by reading *facit . . . facit*, with Baiter, for *faciat . . . faciat* of Mueller and most of the manuscripts. In v. 14, 16 *suasissim* is changed to *suasi*. *Sed*, following Madvig's suggestion. On rather scant evidence, though not unsupported, Bennett reads *te*

i. 1, 1: *consolatione*, ii. 4, 9: *fuerat in arce*, iv. 11, 29: *ne sint*, xi. 34, 8: *vi eveluntur*, xix. 71, 24. The text is altered by simple transposition in i. 2, 6: ii. 4, 31: v. 15, 23: xx. 73, 15: xxiii. 82, 6.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

University of Wisconsin.

TWO EDITIONS OF CAESAR.

C. Iulii Caesaris Belli gallici libri vii. A. Hirtii liber viii. recensuit, apparatus critico instruxit HENRICUS MEUSEL. Berolini, Weber.

C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii ex recensione Bernardi Kübleri. Vol. i. de bello Gallico. Vol. iii. pars prior, commentarius de bello Alexandrino rec. B. KÜBLER, de bello Africo rec. Ed. Wölfflin. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1894, 1896. M. 2. 20.

THE manuscripts of Caesar fall into two classes, rather like the manuscripts of the Acts of the Apostles: that is, one class contains a number of individual words, phrases, etc., which are absent in the other. Until recently, the shorter version was held both in the case of Caesar and in that of St. Luke to be the more genuine, and Nipperdey's characterization of the longer Caesar MSS. as interpolated was generally accepted. Lately there has been a revolt in the criticism of both authors. Blass has tried, with indifferent success, I fancy, to sustain the correctness of the longer version of the Acts: others with better fortune, have restored the reputation of the 'interpolated'

MSS. of Caesar. The grounds for the latter revolt are perhaps better justified than those on which Blass rested. Since Nipperdey, the MSS. of Caesar have been more carefully collated and the lexica of Merguet and still more of Meusel have illustrated the style and diction of the great Roman. Hence it has become generally accepted that the 'interpolated' MSS. deserve full consideration, with the melancholy corollary that all the manuscripts even of the Gallic War have been seriously corrupted at an early date. I need not further criticize the editions named at the head of this paragraph than to say that they represent the revolt against Nipperdey. Mr. Kübler's text is not yet completed but it is a valuable addition to the Teubner series and contains a noteworthy 'Praefatio' of some length. Mr. Meusel's work is terser in form and more attractive in appearance and is thoroughly worthy of recommendation as a scholarly and judicious edition. Both books have convenient indices and maps.

F. H.

AD LUCANI LIBROS MSS.

IN fasciculo M. Maii h. a. Doctissimus WALTER C. SUMMERS aliquae dubia movet de lectionibus MSS. Lucani, quae ego quantum sciam et potero solvam. Potissimum improbat quod saepius meae collationi codicis Montepessulani addidi diversum Steinharti testimonium, eoque, ut ait, lectori optionem dedi, utra lectio, mea an Steinharti, vera esset. Allatis quibusdam locis subiungit (p. 229, col. i.): 'was it not worth while to have these points definitely settled?' Et paulo ante me dubitasse de mea ipsius collatione dicit; 'nor is Dr. Francken always

confident of the accuracy of his own statements.' In hanc partem afferuntur vii. 303, ubi in annotatione commemorans, ubi lectio *parata* extaret, dixi: 'in V et fort. in M.' Nempe sic retulit Steinhart, sed id mihi dubium videri ex verbis apparent ipsis.

ix. 605. dixi 'de M. dubito.' M. scribit versum bis, secundum me utroque loco habet *quam*, secundum Steinh. altero loco legitur *qua*. De hoc Steinh. testimonio me dubitare dixi: de M. dubito an non habeat *qua*, certe altero loco habet *quam*.

ix. 749. 'exquiereret causis' lectionem *ἀμέρπον*

testatur Steinhartus, quem *exquireretausis*, 'exquireret ausis' voluisse, utique *errasse* in Var. Lect. significavi.

His et aliis locis Steinharti testimonium a meo diversum retuli, sed ubique meam ipse collationem secutus sum, unde me meis non diffisum esse manifestum est. Discriben duarum collationum notavi, quoniam testimonium Steinharti *nova collatione explorare non potui*: mea erat dudum confecta et liber MS. Montepessulam remissus, cum Hosii editio, Steinharti collationem continens, prodidit. Testimonium viri, qui inde a dissertatione pro gradu Doctoris defensa usque ad finem vitae in MSS. Lucani legendis versatus est, non liebat temere neglegere. Unde discriben fortasse explicandum sit, dixi in Praefatione, sed certi nihil.

Praetera ad singulos quosdam locos non inutile erit animadvertisse:

p. 228, col. 2, vi. 76 exedit:

romae } V, sic mea coll.
terrae }

vii. 295. *ruentis* in V scriptum est non tanquam V.L., sed velut explicatio.

viii. 48. *vides* G, ut est in textu; de erasa s nihil in mea coll.

p. 229, col. 1. Quoties Hosii Vaticanum memoravi sic notavi: *F. Hosii*. Pertinet F ad codices Hosii 'hic illuc adscitos,' quorum non magnum pondus est, eumque propterea omisi in 'Notis Codicum' initio vol. ii. F igitur si legitur in Var. Lect. corrigendum est T = Taurinensis Dorvillii. Obiter addo hunc, cuius collationem a Dorvillio factam

exhibui, re vera extare etiamnunc Turini, de quo alibi referam.

S in Var. Lect. significat *Scholiastam*, non excluso Commento Useneri.—'In vii. 633 it stands for Servius!' Adde: who two lines before was cited.

vii. 331. 'Two accounts of the reading of his own MS. A.' Non duae relationes unius lectionis, sed una relatio duarum lectionum. A enim habet (referam ut est in mea coll.):

1 m. *ceresque vires*

le

inde factum: *ceresque viris* (sic!)

2 m. *marg*: *ceris viris*.

vi. 316. 'V mentioned along with O.' V post O non significare posse Vossianum animadvertisit Vir Doctissimus; positum erat pro *vulgo*. Sic (*vulgo*) correxeram *deleta* V, sed operae non paruerunt.

Denique Doctissimus vir: Moreover, inquire, there are cases where Dr. Francken does not mention that his account of a MS. reading differs from that of other scholars. See (for M), &c. Ubi omisi M a Steinharto collatum, feci id quoniam de errore eius mihi satis constabat, aut quia mentio nulli bono fuisse. —Addit: see (for V) rell. Non eadem causa est librorum V et M; in hoc litterarum ductus non satis conspicui quid primitus scriptum fuerit saepe dubium faciunt, non item in V.

C. M. FRANCKEN.

TRIECTI AD RHENUM,
31 Maii 1898.

ARCHAEOLOGY

INSCRIPTIONS FROM PATRAS.

THE castle at Patras is entirely of mediaeval construction, but its walls especially on the north-west side are largely composed of fragments from ancient buildings. It is in the shape of an irregular triangle, and the upper part of it near the apex on the height of the ridge is used as a prison. Villehardouin, if as is probable he erected it, seems to have converted the ancient acropolis into a mediaeval fortress in a rough and ready fashion, not even sparing the church of St. Sophia, which was the successor of the famous temple of Artemis Laphria.¹

¹ So Blouet, *Exp. Scient. de la Moree*, i. Introd. p. 7. Leake, *Morea*, ii. 136 quotes Ducange to the effect that the church was destroyed, but I cannot find the passage.

What subsequent alterations of the building took place under Venetian and Turkish occupations, it would take a learned expert to decide. During a few days of enforced leisure, while waiting for a steamer, I examined the walls as far as possible and copied the following inscriptions.

(1) = *C.I.L.* iii. 507 corrected in *Suppl.* i. 7261: on the west side of the round tower in the north-west face of the outer wall. (Letters .05 high. Stone .68 by .30).

It is given in *C.I.L.* as

L · VEIRIO · L · F · QVI
FRONTONI
VETER · LEG · XII · FVL.

The first two letters of the third line are now illegible, the fourth is certainly R and

there seems to be hardly room for five letters in the first word. It looks therefore as if the abbreviation of *veteranus* were here VETR.

(2) Statue basis built into the wall on the east side of the same tower (letters '035 to '05 in height. Width of stone '35. Height '52).

Βαλερίαν
Μοδεστείαν
οι ἀπέλευθεροι.
ψ(ηφίσματι) β(ουλῆς).

(3) As posts of a doorway leading from

σημεῖον αὐθέντον Πανδούλφον
παλαιῶν Πατρῶν τοῦ ανακαι (shield)
ναοῦ τῷ χιλιοστῷ τετρακοσι

the open court of the castle to the prison are two inscribed stones, which it seems worth while to comment on here, though they are not unknown. They seem to have been originally lintels to two doors of a church. Each inscription is divided into two parts by a coat of arms in relief, now almost obliterated.¹

There is a facsimile in the *Expéd. Sci. de la Morée*, vol. iii. pl. 85, but in the supplement p. 64, nos. 7 and 8 Blouet only mentions that they were copied by Trézel.

(a) The Greek text is in C.I.G. 8776. It runs

ντε Μαλατέστοις μροπολίτον
νισαντος τοῦ τῆδε δέον
οστωέικοστω ἐκτω ἔτει.

(accents, as on the stone, wherever legible)

Line 1. Not κομη]ρ[ο]ς (C.I.G.) but ντε Μαλατέστοις = de Malatestis.

2. Old Patras so-called (as in C.I.G. 8771) to distinguish it from Neopatras (Hypata) in the Spercheios valley. There is a sign of abbreviation over the μρ of μροπολίτον.

IN SIGNIV SEV ARMA
ALATESTIS ARCHI (shield)
HEDIFICATORIS HVII

Line 1. The last letter of the first word is shown by the squeeze to be the same as the last of the second word, and in my copy appears what seems to be an abbreviation mark over it. The form 'insignium' is quite certain here for coat of arms. The last letters of the line are now illegible, but μ must be restored. Line 2. In the last word the fifth letter is certainly Λ (not as in Trézel's copy); an abbreviation mark must be restored over the probable ε and we get *Patracensis*, the correct adjective, (Lequien. *Oriens Christianus*, iii. p. 1023 Provincia Patrarum Veterum. Ecclesia Patracensis Metropolis). Line 3. The third letter of the second word is an ordinary ι with a curl to it as compendium for *huius*. Over the μ and ν of the date is ο, indicating *millesimo sexto*: if it existed over c and x, it is no longer visible.

The interest of this inscription is that it marks the end of Frankish and Latin domination in Greece. Pandulph di Malatesta of Pesaro was born in 1390 and is described (Litta, *Famiglie celebri*) as 'gobbo, storpio, e di brutta faccia; cosicchè il padre

3. στ written in one character. The acute accent is placed over the first letter of the syllable accented, whether vowel or consonant, the grave on the last.

(b) Latin text, in black letter, much worn and hard to read even in the French facsimile

DOMINI PANDVLFI DE [M]
EPISCOPI PATRACE
ECCLESIE MCCCCXXV.

non potendo farne un soldato ne fece un prete.² His sister Cleope was married in 1419 to Thomas Palaeologos one of the despots of Morea,² and no doubt because of this marriage he was made archbishop of Patras in 1424, governing the place 'as the temporal no less than the spiritual deputy of the Pope' (Finlay). The Latin influence was however nearly gone, and Pandulph was not a person to revive it successfully. This inscription tells us that he set to work immediately to rebuild the church within the fortress, as the only safe place for the metropolitan throne; thus we have an incidental proof how hateful the papal domination was to the obstinately orthodox Greeks of the Morea. After the completion of this work he seems to have retired to Italy, and in his absence Constantine the despot, who already ruled over Vostitza on one side and Chlarentza on the other tried to get hold of Patras. After an unsuccessful attempt, in which the chronicler Phrantzes was taken prisoner, the townspeople agreed that if the archbishop did not return by the end of May, they would sur-

¹ Those who care to see what it was like will find it in P. Litta, *Famiglie celebri di Italia*, Pt. 159, Tav. I (L. Passerini).

² According to Phrantzes, *Chronicon*, ii. 10 to Theodore. Phrantzes also seems to imply that she died at Sparta, not at Pesaro.

render the town. Accordingly on June 5th Constantine entered Patras. A few days later Pandulph arrive in a Catalan ship but was unable to do anything to relieve the garrison of the fortress, which after holding out for about a year was obliged to surrender (*Phrantzes* ii. cc. 6-8). This was the end of the Latin hierarchy in the Morea, for though Lequien mentions the name of two more archbishops of Patras, clearly neither of them ever set foot in the place.

To the scanty remains of antiquity in Patras mentioned by Dr. Frazer should be added the Roman mosaic in the square near Mr. Wood's villa, which is now covered up but will probably be soon published. I regret to say that the marble casing of the seats in the Odeion has nearly all been stolen.

G. C. RICHARDS.

WEICHARDT'S POMPEII.

C. WEICHARDT : Pompeii vor der Zerstörung. Reconstructionen der Tempel und ihrer Umgebung. Köhler, Leipzig, 1897. 50 m.

EVERY student of Pompeii—one may almost say every serious visitor to Pompeii—endeavours to restore the ruined city ; for without reconstruction Pompeii inevitably remains a mere collection of fragmentary ruins, capable of exciting only a temporary curious interest in the visitor. Yet not every Pompeian student, however well trained he may be in archaeology, has the ability to reduce to drawing the reconstruction he builds in his mind, so that he constantly labours under the disadvantage of never seeing clearly and objectively his restoration in proper relation to its surroundings. Weichardt, however, is fortunately well equipped in the direction in which so many investigators are weak. He is by profession an architect and a teacher of decoration and ornament in Leipzig, but has been compelled to spend much time in the South, where for some years he has given himself to the study of Pompeii. In the course of his investigations, the restorations which, with explanatory text, appear in the book before us, have been made to satisfy the investigator's own needs, and not in the first instance for publication ; that they are now given to the public is due to the encouragement and urging of his fellow-investigators, and, one may conjecture, not least to the friendship of the first of Pompeian

scholars, August Mau, to whom the book is dedicated.

Weichardt has devoted the present volume to restorations of seven Pompeian temples. These restorations are presented in twelve folio plates made from water colours by the author, as well as in numerous smaller illustrations, and are in the main superior to the olden restorations, such as Piranesi's of the Temple of Isis, the work of Mazois and of Rossini, and the miniatures of Gell and Gandy.

After an introduction, describing the origin and purpose of his work, Weichardt gives in chap. i. a brief account of the history of Pompeii and of its destruction ; in chap. ii. he discusses the situation of the city in relation to Vesuvius and the surrounding country, concentrating his attention, however, on the so-called *forum triangulare*. The text here, as throughout the book, is well illustrated by plans, sketches, and reproductions of photographs taken for the purpose. Even to one who knows Pompeii well, the two folio plates will prove a surprise and pleasure. Pl. i. shows in the foreground a restoration of the platform and southern (rear) side of the four-storied house, commonly known as Casa di Giuseppe II. ; the middle of the picture is occupied by the *forum triangulare*, with the Greek temple upon it ; beyond stretches the valley of the Sarno, shown at its ancient level before the lava stream of 79 A.D. had raised it some nine metres. The second folio plate presents a reverse view of that shown in the first : the spectator looks from a point south-east of the *forum triangulare*, past the forum, along the southern (s.w.) side of the city to the bay beyond. With these plates before him, one realises how the promontory of the ancient lava stream, on which Pompeii was built, rose at this point abruptly from the valley, and becomes more favourably inclined to the theory, which Mazois first expressed, that this point formed the arx of the ancient settlement.

The reconstruction of the south-east corner of the *forum triangulare* is a difficult problem, which can be finally settled only when future excavations bring new remains to light. Weichardt has succeeded in showing, however, the probable manner in which the city wall, coming from the Stabian Gate, ran into the higher retaining wall of the forum. He then supposes, as Mazois and Fiorelli before him have done, that a flight of steps connected the lower level of the city wall with the forum plateau above, a theory for which no sufficient monumental proof

has yet been found. Mazois supposed a change in direction in the south-west (the outer) wall of the forum, and a prolongation of the wall to permit a flight of steps to rise from the lower level, and open into the peribolos above. Fiorelli proposed a kind of bastion tower, with steps within. Weichardt, however, makes the flight of steps rise directly from the terrace formed by the city wall, and lead at the top into a passage behind the peribolos, and above the gladiators' barracks. This restoration must be regarded as uncertain for lack of evidence, as just stated; furthermore, the necessity of supposing that any such connection existed at this place is not apparent.

From the discussion of the forum plateau, Weichardt goes on to consider the Greek temple, and the buildings about it. Pl. iii. shows a restoration of the temple viewed from the south-east, with the round doric well house in the foreground, and the peribolos on two sides of the triangle. In his restoration of the temple Weichardt departs from the usual arrangement, which allots six columns to the ends,¹ and supplies seven, whereby the temple becomes properly a pseudo-dipteros. The arguments which Weichardt advances in favour of his arrangement are sound, and seem convincing; and the familiar wall-painting, reproduced here after Gell, in which seven of the ten structures represented, apparently temples, show façades with unequal numbers of columns, proves that the ancients had no deep-seated objection to such an arrangement. One must, however, remind himself while examining the restorations shown in Plates i.-iii., that they cannot represent the Greek temple in the period 63-79 A.D., for this temple was apparently in ruins as early as the republican period, and had been replaced by a smaller shrine.

A successful restoration of the Temple of Apollo and its court (chap. v., plates iv. and v.), is followed by an account of ancient and modern excavations in Pompeii. Weichardt then passes to the *forum civile*, and the Temple of Jupiter, with its immediate surroundings. The reconstructions are excellent. The restoration of the so-called arch of Nero, too, is more successful than that of Mazois or that of Rossini in some respects, especially in the arrangement of the columns; but fancy has such free rein here that no restoration can be considered

to be of much authority. Pl. ix. and the corresponding chapter are devoted to the Temple of Fortuna Augusta. Weichardt's attempt to use the rude relief found in the house of L. Caecilius Secundus for the reconstruction of this temple, and of the arch which spans the *Strada di Mercurio*, seems to us hopeless. If the relief pictures any reality, it shows a part of the north end of the *forum civile*. Equally unsuccessful must be any attempt to establish the so-called equestrian statue of Nero as a portrait statue of any member of the imperial house.

In his study of the small temple on the north-east side of the *forum civile*, which since Mau's investigations is regarded as a Temple to Vespasian, Weichardt was led to search in the National Museum at Naples for the slab adorned with ornamental relief, and for the pilaster capital, reported by Mazois as coming from the temple. Weichardt was so fortunate in his search as not only to rediscover the missing slab and capital in the court of the museum, where they have remained unnoticed apparently for over half a century, but also to find the correct application of the slab to the temple. The back of the slab proved to have the same ornamentation as the front, a fact which at once excluded the theory held by Mazois, that it belonged to a frieze. Furthermore, measurements showed that four such slabs, with the necessary five posts, exactly filled the front of the temple podium, while a slab at either side reached to the top of the steps leading to the ground, thus furnishing a complete balustrade for the temple. In the restoration (Pl. x.), the pilaster capital is not employed, as there is no certainty as to its proper place.

The restoration of the Temple of Isis and its court is equally successful, although here, as elsewhere, many will raise objection to details, especially to details of ornamentation. The last restoration, that of the temple of the Capitoline Divinities (so-called Temple of Zeus Meilichios), is the least fortunate of all. As the ruins do not show the columniation, the restoration here rests only on comparison with other monuments and on general probability. Among the possible arrangements of the columns, that which Mazois adopted, i.e., four columns in front and two at either side, or even the plan shown by Weichardt, fig. 127 iii., i.e., corner pilasters with two columns in front and one on either side, is preferable to the arrangement of three columns flanked by pilasters which Weichardt employs.

The book closes with a translation of

¹ So Overbeck-Mau, *Pompeii*, Leipsic, 1884; Duhn and Jacobi, *der griechische Tempel in Pompeii*, Heidelberg, 1890; but Mau in his *Führer durch Pompeii*, 2^{te} Aufl. 1896, p. 35 shows seven columns.

Pliny's well-known letters to Tacitus, describing the eruption of Vesuvius and his uncle's death.

As just stated, many will raise objections to details in Weichardt's restorations. His ornamentation and pediment reliefs are not always happy; but a careful study of the work will lead one to overlook these matters, which are of but slight importance compared to the service which he has done in rebuilding these ruined temples for us with so large a measure of success. Curtius, who saw some of these plates a short time before his death, declared that at last Pompeii came to him with a living meaning, a statement which will be repeated by many.

Weichardt makes the welcome promise of a second volume, devoted to the private houses of Pompeii. One may venture to hope that in this second volume polychromy may be used without making the cost of the work too great; effective as the monochrome plates in the present work are, the successful use of colour would have greatly increased their value.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.
University of Chicago.

FURTWAENGLER'S CATALOGUE OF THE SOMZÉE COLLECTION.

Sammlung Somzée: Antike Kunstdenkmäler herausgegeben von ADOLF FURTWAENGLER. (43 Plates), Munich, Verlaganstalt F. Bruckmann, 1897. 80m.

THE collection of M. Somzée in Brussels is the growth of recent years, consisting for the greater part of statues which once adorned various great private collections in Rome. Like Herr Jacobsen, whose Glyptotheke at NyCarlsberg near Copenhagen, is now famous, M. Somzée has understood how to profit by the impoverishment of noble Italian families consequent upon the events of 1870, and by the impotence of the Italian government to prevent the exportation of works of art from Rome. Professor Furtwängler bids us view this traffic with impartiality: 'we hail with satisfaction', he writes in the preface to the publication before us, 'the fact that so many neglected statues, once improperly adapted to the indifferent adornment of the courts and gardens of the Roman nobility, should now have found their way to the North, where they are duly appreciated and understood.' This proposition might be assented to, were only 'courts and gardens' robbed of their statues. But buyer's opportunities have not been limited to those works—for

the most part of minor importance—which had been exposed to the open air. At NyCarlsberg, for instance, we find both the Hera and the superb Anakreon from the Villa Borghese, while the kernel of the Somzée collection consists largely of statues which once formed part of the *Galleria Ludovisi*, the most celebrated of all the princely Roman collections.¹ When in consequence of financial losses sustained by its owners, the collection Ludovisi passed to its new home in the Museo Boncompagni, it had already lost many of the works noted in Schreiber's catalogue, and not a few of these now reappear in Brussels. Indeed this seems to be only the first stage in a process of disintegration: the Museo Boncompagni which contains,—or did a short while ago contain—such artistic treasures as the throne with the reliefs of the Birth of Aphrodite, the grand and original archaic head with its triple row of curls (Helbig, *Coll. of Classical Antiquities in Rome*, 882), the Hermes (Helbig 871) possibly after Telephanes of Phokaia, and the Athena signed by [Ant]iochos, has now been inexorably closed to the public for more than two years, and if report speaks true, its dispersion is imminent. If artistic and archaeological studies are to continue to have their centre in Rome, it is time that the Italian government should keep zealous watch over the private collections, and should enforce the laws it has passed against the secret sale and purchase of works of art. It is strange that in this respect, Italy should betray greater impotence than Greece. Meanwhile, if the works must go out of the country, we may so far agree with Professor Furtwängler as to feel grateful that they should fall into the hands of collectors as enlightened as M. Somzée and Herr Jacobsen, who hasten to make them known far and wide by means of sumptuous publications. It is not possible in a review to do more than touch upon a few of the most important among the objects so admirably reproduced by Messrs. Bruckmann, and described by Professor Furtwängler. The work is divided into two parts: the first containing marble sculpture, for the most part Roman copies of Greek originals; the second smaller objects such as terra-cottas, vases, bronzes and miniature statuary. Among the Roman

¹ 'The Museo Ludovisi contained, perhaps, more masterpieces of Greco-Roman art than Sallust and his Imperial successors had been able to gather in the gardens.'—Lanciani, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 418.

copies especially interesting is the colossal statue of a nude, helmeted youth (Plate IV.) which Furtwängler somewhat audaciously traces back to Mikon, painter and sculptor, the basis of whose Kallias at Olympia, reveals a pose identical with that of the Somzée warrior. On Plate VII. we have a beautiful replica of a Polykleitan figure; on Plate VIII. a statuette of Aphrodite after an original of the Pheidian period. The new replica of the Athena Parthenos on Plate IX. 12 is poor and free, and obviously inferior to the replica lately discovered by Mr. Cecil Smith at Patras, and published by him in the *Annals of the British School at Athens*. On the same plate we have a replica of the Praxitelean Athena in Woburn Abbey, a work to which our author has lately discovered an interesting analogy in a statue of the [Museo Correr at Venice].¹ On Plate X. we note a superb bearded Asklepios, offering marked stylistic affinities to the 'Apollo on the Omphalos' now generally accepted as a copy after Kalamis. Furtwängler finds external evidence to corroborate the Kalamidian origin of the Somzée statue: the right arm of this Asklepios is raised high as if to grasp a sceptre, the left is bent forward as if to hold an attribute, so that neither hand can have held the usual snake-wreathed staff of the god of healing. But this gesture of the hands would, as Furtwängler points out, accord admirably with the description Pausanias gives of the gold-ivory Asklepios executed by Kalamis for Sikyon, since the god held the sceptre with one hand and a fir cone in the other (Paus. ii. 10, 3). On Plate XIV. we have a very lovely variant of the 'Satyr pouring wine,' commonly attributed to Praxiteles; on Plates XVII. and XVIII. excellent torsi of the Knidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles and of the 'Aphrodite wringing her hair' after Apelles. Plate XXI. shows a good replica of the charming statuette in the Uffizi (Amelung, *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz* 84) of a nymph seated on a rock and tying her sandal. Amid so many copies we doubly welcome a superb original of the Hellenistic period, (Plate XXV.) representing a barbarian with long hair tied in a knot over the right ear, in the fashion recorded by Tacitus to have been peculiar to the German tribe of the Bastarnai whom Prof. Furtwängler has so ably identified on the monument of Adamklissi.² On Plate XXVI. we find one of

the innumerable replicas of the portrait so long misnamed 'Seneca,' the interpretation of which is a time-honoured archaeological puzzle. As might be expected Prof. Furtwängler is ready with a new solution. The head, which is unanimously attributed to the Hellenistic period, and which has lately been interpreted as Philetas or Kallimachos (Helbig 459) he takes to be an 'imaginary portrait' (after the fashion of the portraits of Homer) of the Iambic poet Hippoanax, giving late expression to the legend of his ugliness, preserved for us by Pliny and by Metrodorus of Skepsis (*ap. Athenais* xii. 552, c). *Hippoanax notabilis foeditas voltus erat*, says Pliny, and the head certainly represents some very ugly person; so far, but no further, do we think Prof. Furtwängler has grounds for his proposed interpretation, which, for the present, it will be prudent to count only as conjecture. The Somzée replica is fine, but (judging from the plate) scarcely so fine as the Florentine replica in the room of the Hermaphrodite at the Uffizi (Amelung 165), a head which Dr. Amelung esteems so highly as to suggest that it may be the original of the various replicas. That the subject was capable in the hands of a great artist of far higher refinements than are observable in any of the extant busts, is proved by the admirable reproduction of it, after some replica that had found its way to Flanders, in the background of the picture by Rubens (in the Pitti) representing himself with his brother and Justus Lipsius. The superb Antinoos deified as Dionysos, from the coll. Casali, of which Winckelman wrote that it was 'the finest of the statues of Antinoos,' is given on Plates XXVIII. and XXIX. Together with the grand head of Hadrian (Sciarrà-Barberini) wrongly adapted to a bust of the Augustan period, it should suffice to give celebrity to the Somzée collection. Among the bronzes not a few are of original workmanship: so the remarkable archaic statuette of a youthful rider (Plate XXXII., 83) resembling a bronze from the Peloponnesus now at Athens, and on the same plate (84) a work of the early part of the fifth century—a rare Corinthian bronze representing a nude youth, designed as the support of a mirror. But the palm among the bronzes must be awarded to a lovely flying Ikaros (Plate XXVIII.), found in Smyrna, a genuine little masterpiece of fourth-century workmanship. The subject is unique, and from the provenance of the bronze, Furtwängler aptly conjectures it to have come from Nikaria, the ancient Ikaria, the *'Ikárouv ðōs* of Aischylos, where

¹ See *Griechische Originalstatuen in Venedig*, von Adolf Furtwängler, Munich, 1898.

² *Intermezzii*. No. 4, p. 67 ff.

Pausanias records was the burial place of Ikaros. We close our notice of the sculpture with what is really the gem of the whole collection, namely a miniature bearded head of Zeus or Asklepios treated, in spite of its diminutive size, in the purest Pheidian manner. The likeness of the head to that of the Pheidian Zeus on coins of Olympia, noted by Furtwängler is significant. The present writer has repeatedly examined this head and can testify to its amazing beauty. The collection also includes not a few interesting vases. Let it suffice to mention here the Corinthian clylix decorated with the slaying of the Minotaur by Theseus, and of Acheloos by Herakles. Not only are subjects of rare occurrence in this class of vases, but the presentation of the Minotaur is unique; the monster, instead of wrestling with his adversary, is shown fallen to the ground, only painfully lifting himself on his right arm. The whole scene, indeed, is treated with a freshness of invention which, as the author does not fail to point out, should make us wary of believing, as some would have it, that the Greek vase-painters always confined themselves within the rigid lines of an established type.

Even from these short and inadequate indications some notion may be formed of the materials gathered by M. Somzée and of Prof. Furtwängler's comments and conclusions. For the collection itself, and for the book which makes it known there can be nothing but praise. If some of us would prefer that many of these statues should have remained in Rome to adorn the *Museo delle Terme*, it is because they feel and believe that a number of scattered and comparatively small collections, however well arranged and described, can never equal in point of interest or enjoyment, the imposing spectacle of conquering Rome led in triumph by *Graecia capta*.

Finally, we note that the text is profusely illustrated with monuments from other collections, helping to throw light on the objects under discussion. This excellent method, which one could wish to see adopted in our English catalogues, had been inaugurated, if we mistake not, by Dr. Arndt in his publication of the Collection Jacobsen, and employed by Dr. Amelung in his *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz*.

EUGÉNIE STRONG.

Epigrafia Latina, by S. Ricci. Trattato elementare con esercizi pratici e facsimili illustrativi. Milano, 1897. 8vo. xxxii., 447 pp. Con 65 tav. 6 l. 50 c.

Ricci's *Epigrafia Latina* is similar in plan and scope to Egbert's 'Latin Inscriptions' and Cagnat's *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, on which Egbert's manual is largely based. Though somewhat smaller than either of these books, it is well filled with interesting material for epigraphical study. The subject is treated under six general heads with convenient sub-divisions and numerous appendices. Inscriptions are classified according to time, subject and material. The literary and historical importance of the study is clearly set forth, and correct methods of work are outlined. An excellent bibliography, a large number of practical exercises with references to authorities, and a full list of abbreviations make this a serviceable handbook for beginners.

The facsimiles and illustrations on sixty-five plates, many of them double-page, are worthy of special mention. One would scarcely expect so much illustrative material at such moderate cost. In this feature the book is superior to Cagnat's and nearly equal to Egbert's.

The list of additions and corrections is rather long; and a single reading reveals a few slips and misprints not included in the author's list, though none of a serious character. It is, in fact, almost impossible to keep such a work entirely free from typographical errors. In a second edition, which ought to be reached in due time, these defects can be remedied.

Professor Ricci dedicates his modest, but scholarly *Manuale di Epigrafia Latina* to his distinguished teachers, Lattes, de Ruggiero and Lanciani, honourable names in classical scholarship. One who has caught the spirit of such masters could hardly send forth a dull production.

The book is supplied with a good index, and is neat and attractive in its mechanical make up.

F. E. ROCKWOOD.

Lewisburg, Pa.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Philology. Vol. xxvi. No. 51. 1898.

The Strong Hephthemimeral Pause in Latin Hexameter Poetry, W. E. Heitland. This pause is much more important in Lat. than in Gk. and occurs in two forms, in one of which (B) the break comes after an iambic word following a third trochee, while in the other (A) it does not. The hepthem. pause came more and more into favour after the publication of the *Aeneid*, with a preference for the B form, as is seen in Ovid. *A New Homeric Papyrus*, A. S. Hunt. The text is given of a papyrus acquired in Egypt last winter by Mr. B. P. Grenfell. It contains the greater part of *Iliad* xiii and xiv. The hand is a fine specimen of the literary uncial and probably falls within the first century A.D. *Emendations in the First Book of Manilius*, A. E. Housman. *On a Fragment of Solon*, A. Platt. A reply to Prof. Jebb's criticism in the last no. but one [Cl. Rev. xi, 227]. *Orphica*, A. Platt. Emendations of the Argonautica. *A Homeric Idiom defended*, A. Platt. On the use of κερ or δεν with the aor. opt. in the same sense as a past tense of the indic. with the same particles. When a verb has no aor. of its own the pres. opt. may be used instead. *On Cicero Pro Cluentio* §§ 115, 116, J. P. Postgate. Reads non remittunt non admittunt in § 116 on the ground of the sense required. *Various Conjectures*, iv, W. G. Headlam. In T 79 explains οὐδὲ τοικεν as = οὐδὲ τοικεν δε in direct opposition to μεν. Other conjectures are made on Simonides, Hermesianax, Athenaeus, The Anthology, Callimachus, Manetho, and Apoll. Rhod. *Actna* 171, 2 Muirro, R. Ellis. Reads quassat citatu for quassat hiato. *Emendations Homericæ*, (Od. i-v), T. L. Agar. These emendations are mostly directed against omissions of the digamma, the hiatus licitus, omission of κερ with the opt. in certain locutions, and other anomalies. *On Some Passages in the Seventh Book of the Eudemian Ethics*, H. Jackson.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 155. Part 12. 1898.

Fasti Delphici, ii. 2 (conclusion), H. Pomtow. (3) The Amphiktyonic states as members of the Aetolian league. (4) The dating of the Archontate, concluding with a table which gives the dates of the Delphic archons of five groups of decrees between 278 and 220 B.C. [see Cl. Rev. sup. p. 144]. *Zu Ciceros briefen*, C. F. W. Müller. Notices the superstitious reverence with which critics follow the traditional text in many places. *Zu Ciceros briefen an Atticus*, W. Sternkopf. In Att. iv, 19, 2 [sic. iv, 18, 3?] defends hibernam legiōnēm of the text. *Die litteratur der witzworte in Rom. und die geflügelten worte im munde Caesars*, H. Peter. Discusses the sayings

attributed to Caesar, ἀνερπίθω κύβος; καὶ σό, τέκνον; and τοῦτο ἐβουλήθησαν. *Kleine beobachtungen zum lateinischen sprachgebrauch*, M. C. P. Schmidt. On exige ut: posco and compounds with substantival clauses: invitare ut or with infin.: imperare and postulare with acc. and infin. pass: quoque in sentences of comparison. *On putare*, existimare; summa, numeri, M. C. P. Schmidt. *Zu den publicationskosten der attischen volksbeschlässe*, E. Drenup. *Grosz-Arabien*, W. Schwarz. On some towns on the east coast of Africa mentioned by the geographer of Ravenna. *Zu Ciceros rede pro Flacco*, A. du Mesnil. Claims priority for the discovery announced by Sternkopf [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 144]. *Zu Plinius naturalis historia*, K. Mayhoff. Textual notes on viii §§ 34, 182, 61, ix § 140, xi § 166. *Zur textkritik Platons*, K. J. Liebold. *Zu Plautus Truculentus*, L. Reinhardt. On prol. 5 and vv. 257, 263. *Die Polybius-handschrift im alten serial zu Constantinopel*, Th. Büttner-Wobst. This MS., noticed by F. Blass in *Hermes* (1888), though it belongs to the younger MSS., is important for the criticism of the history of the text. *Ἀρχαιρεσθενῆς*, F. Poland. On the meaning of this in Greek inscriptions.

[With this vol. the *Neue Jahrbücher f. Phil. u. Paed.* comes to an end. It is in some respects continued by the following publication which is however only partially devoted to classical literature.]

Neue Jahrbücher für Das Klassische Altertum Geschichte und Deutsche Litteratur und für Pädagogik. Vol. i. Part I. 1898.

Antike Humanität, Th. Zielinski. A review of the book of this title by M. Schneidewin. The subject is treated in four divisions, viz. The relation of Man (1) to Man, (2) to State and Fatherland, (3) to Science and Art, (4) to Nature. *Die sociale Dichtung der Griechen*, R. Pöhlmann. *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, H. Peter. A review of the work of this title brought out by the Prussian Academy, Part 1, edited by E. Klebs, and Part 2 by H. Desso.

Part 2. *Die sociale Dichtung der Griechen*, (continued) R. Pöhlmann. *Virgil's vierte Ekloge*, F. Marx. A critical analysis of the poem. The puer is a son of Pollio, viz. C. Asinius Gallus. *Aus dem Klassischen Süden*, A. Holm. A review of the book of this title written by some who took part in three Baden Studienreise and illustrated with photographs by J. Nöhring of Lübeck.

Part 3. *Römischer Götterbilder*, G. Wissowa. A paper read before the 44th meeting of German philologists at Dresden. *Cicero und Terentia*, O. E. Schmidt. Defends Cicero in the matter of the divorce. *Die sociale Dichtung der Griechen*, (concluded) R. Pöhlmann.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Auden (H. W.) Greek Unseen for the use of higher forms and University Students. Introduction, hints on translation. 12mo. 164 pp. Blackwood. 2s. 6d.
— Higher Latin Prose. 12mo. 152 pp. Blackwood. 2s. 6d.

Blass (F.) The Philology of the Gospels. Crown 8vo. 258 pp. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
Bolesford (G. W.) The Development of the Athenian Constitution. (Cornell Studies No. 4.) 8vo. 8,249 pp. Macmillan & Co. \$1 50c.
Caesar. First Book of Caesar's Gallic War, with

notes and vocabulary by A. W. Roberts. 16mo. xv, 204 pp. Boston, Ginn. 50 cents.
 — The Gallic War, Book III. Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by John Brown. Map. 12mo. 80 pp. Blackie. 1s.
Cicero. In *Catilinam I* with introduction, notes, test papers and translation by T. T. Jeffery and T. R. Mills. Crown 8vo. 98 pp. Clive. 3s.
 — Letters to Atticus, Book II., with introduction, notes and appendices by A. Pretor. 12mo. 158 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 3s.
 — *Laelius, de amicitia*, with introduction and notes by J. K. Lord. 12mo. II. 109 pp. American Book Co. 70c.
Cleop (F. L. Van). Index *Antiphonetus*. (Cornell Studies No. 5). 8vo. vi, 173 pp. Macmillan Co. \$1.
Elmer (Herbert C.). Studies in Latin moods and tenses. (Cornell Studies No. 6.) 8vo. ix, 231 pp. Macmillan Co. \$1 50c.
Pearbanks (A.). The first philosophers of Greece, an edition and translation of the remaining fragments of the pre-Socratic philosophers. 8vo. 310 pp. Kegan Paul. 7s. 6d.
Ferguson (W. Scott). The Athenian Secretaries. (Cornell Studies No. 7). 8vo. vi, 80 pp. Macmillan Co. 50c.
Gibson (J.) and W. T. James. Latin at Sight. Containing Passages recently set for Army and Civil Service Candidates. 8vo. 78 pp. Cornish. 2s. 6d.
 — Latin Retranslation or the English Version of Latin at Sight. 8vo. 84 pp. Cornish. 3s. 6d.
Homer. *Iliad*, Book 24, with introduction and notes by J. H. Haydon. Crown 8vo. 86 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
Huddleston (J. H.). Greek tragedy in the light of Vase Paintings. Crown 8vo. 202 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
Ince (J.). Latin Grammar of Pharmacy for Medical and Pharmaceutical Students, includ. Reading of Latin Prescriptions, Latin-English and English-Latin Reference Vocabularies and Prosody. Crown 8vo. 376 pp. Bailliere. 5s.
Modlin (W.). A primer of Latin Grammar. Preface by F. B. Jevons. Crown 8vo. 248 pp. Rivington. 2s. 6d.

Niebuhr (B. G.). Lectures on the History of Rome from the earliest times to the fall of the Western Empire. Edited by L. Schmitz. 5th ed. Crown 8vo. 840 pp. Taylor. 3s. 6d.
Oman (C.). History of the Art of War: the Middle Ages, from the 4th to the 14th century. 8vo. 654 pp., maps, engravings. Methuen. 21s.
Oxyrhynchus Papri, edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
 This volume, which will be published at the end of July, for the Egypt Exploration Fund, by Mr. Henry Frowde, will contain 158 texts, 31 being literary and including the early fragments of St. Matthew's Gospel, Sappho, Aristoxenos, Sophocles and of other lost and extant classics. The remainder is a selection of public and private documents dating from the first to the seventh century of our era. The texts are accompanied by introductions, notes, and in most cases by translations. The work will contain eight colotype plates illustrating the papyri of principal literary and paleographical importance.
Ritchie (F.). *Discernenda*. Latin words liable to be confounded. Crown 8vo. 34 pp. 9d.
Schmitz (L.). History of Rome from the earliest times to the death of Commodus, A.D. 192. Crown 8vo. 562 pp., engravings. Taylor. 3s. 6d.
Smith (Sir W.). *Initia Graeca*. Part I. A first course for the use of the Lower Forms. 26th impression, thoroughly revised and in great part rewritten. Crown 8vo. 210 pp. Murray. 3s. 6d.
Smith's Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, incorporating the results of modern research, by F. W. Cornish. 8vo. 836 pp., engravings. Murray. 21s.
Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments, with critical notes, commentary and translation (in English prose), by R. C. Jebb. Part 4, The Philoctetes. 2nd ed. 8vo. 334 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
Tacitus. *Vita Agricolae*, with introduction and notes by Hy. Furneaux. 8vo. 188 pp. Frowde. 6s. 6d.
Walton (A.). The Cult of Asklepios. (Cornell Studies No. 3). 8vo. viii, 136 pp. Macmillan Co. 80c.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aetna. Erklärt von S. Sudhaus. 8vo. x, 230 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. Cloth. 7 Mk.
Aly (Fr.). Jahresbericht über die Geschichte der römischen Literatur 1891-1896. (Aus "Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Altertumswissenschaften") 8vo. 32 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 1 Mk. 20.
Ammianus Marcellinus. Malotet (A.) de Ammiani Marcellini digressionibus quae ad externas gentes pertineant. 8vo. 70 pp. Paris, Leroux.
Ardaillon (E.). Quomodo Graeci collocaverint portus atque aedificaverint. 8vo. 79 pp. Lille.
Aristophanes. *Lysistrata*, traduction nouvelle par Ch. Zevort, avec des notes. 18mo. 181 pp., 100 coloured engravings. Paris, Charpentier. 3 f. 50 c.
Aristoteles. Della Rettorica di Aristotile fatta italiana da Annibal Caro (testo di lingua), commento di F. Mastelloni. 8vo. xviii, 338 pp. Firenze, Le Monnier. 4 lire.
 — Parigot (H.). Cujusmodi sit imitatio in illo Aristotelis libro qui de poetica inscribitur. 8vo. 103 pp. Paris, Calman Levy.

Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis ed. Fr. Blass. 12mo. lxv, 200 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2Mk. 40.
Bocchtel (F.). Die einstammigen, männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind. 4to. 86 pp. Berlin Weidman. 5 Mk. 50.
 (Aus "Abh. der philol.-histor. Klasse der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften")
Bochlan (Johs.). Aus ionischen und italischen Necropolen. Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der nachmykenischen griechischen Kunst. 4to. v, 172 pp., 15 plates, 1 map and numerous engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 20 Mk.
Borneque (H.). Quid de structura rhetorica praeceperint grammatici atque rhetores latini. 8vo. 88 pp. Paris, Bouillon.
Buchholz (E.). Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen. Vol II. Die melischen und chorischen Dichter. Erklärt und mit Einleitungen von J. Sitzler. 8vo. iv. 211 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 2 Mk. 10.
Bugge (Sophus). Lykische Studien. I. Aus)

"Videnskabsselskabets Skrifter.") 8vo. 91 pp. Christiania. 3 Mk. 70.

Caesar. Sydow (Rud.) Kritische Beiträge zu Caesar's bellum gallicum. 4to. 23 pp. Berlin, Weber. 1 Mk.

Cicero. Hoyer (Rud.) Die Urschrift von Cicero de officiis I-III. 4to. 24 pp. Kreuznach. 1 Mk.

— Stangl (T.) Tulliana. Der Text des Thesaurus linguae Latinae zu Cicero de oratore in ausgewählten Stellen besprochen. 8vo. 60 pp. München.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Stählin (O.) Untersuchungen über die Scholien zu Clemens Alexandrinus. 8vo. 48 pp. Nürnberg.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis. Roth (K.) Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Dionysius von Halikarnass. 8vo. 52 pp. Bayreuth.

Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae. Ad fidem codicis Bodleiani rec. H. Schenkl. Accedunt fragmenta enchyridion ex rec. Schweighauseri, gnomologiorum Epicteteorum reliquiae. Editio minor. 12mo. xvi, 499 pp. 1 plate. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.

Euripidis fabulæ, ediderunt R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. I., Pars IV, Electra, ed. N. Wecklein. 8vo. vi, 69 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

— Oeri (Jak.) Die Euripideischen Verszahlensysteme. 4to. 34 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.

Ferrère (F.) La situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine depuis la fin du IV^e siècle jusqu'à l'invasion des Vandales (429). 8vo. xxiv, 382 pp. Paris, Alcau. 7 f. 50.

Fisch (R.) Eine Wanderung nach den Trümmern von Ostia. 4to. 37 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Gardthausen (V.) Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig. 8vo. xx, 92 pp. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 5 Mk.

Gompertz (Th.) Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik griechischer Schriftsteller. 8vo. 29 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 80 Pf.

(Aus "Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften.")

Haberda (A.) Bericht über eine archäologische Studienfahrt der Schüler des k. k. Staats-Gymnasiums in Krems nach Cornuntum. 8vo. 9 pp. Krems.

Heilig (W.) Les vases du Dipylon et les Naucratis. 4to. 39 pp., engravings. Paris, Klincksieck.

Hebbing (A.) Der Zug der Cimberns und Teutonen. Eine Studie. 8vo. viii, 68 pp. Zürich, Müller. 1 Mk.

Herondas. Le Maitre d'école : le sacrifice à Esculape. Texte grec par Héronidas, avec introduction et commentaire par E. Ragon. 18mo. 36 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.

— Les mêmes œuvres ; traduction française par E. Ragon. 18mo. 12 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.

Herrlich (S.) Epidaurus, eine antike Heilstätte. 4to. 32 pp., 1 plate. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Homer. Gemoll (A.) Bericht über die homerischen Realien 1885-1895. (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.') 8vo. 46 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 2 Mk. 40.

Homerus. Schmid (C.) Der Troianerfries vom Heroon in Gjölbashi-Thrysa, Benndorf und die Ilias. 8vo. 55 pp. München.

Horatius. Städler (H.) Horaz' zeitgeschichtliche Oden in Reimstrophäen verdeutscht. Mit einer Uebersicht der Ereignisse während Horaz' Lebenszeit (65-8v. Chr.) 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Hütter (L.) Bericht über die römische Geschichte für die Jahre 1889-1893. (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Altertumswissenschaft.') 8vo. 277 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 10 Mk. 80.

Isocrates. Vollnhals (W.) Ueber das Verhältnis der Rede des Isocrates περὶ ἀντιδοσίων zu Platons Apologie des Sokrates. 8vo. 28 pp. Bamberg. Jahrbuch des Kaiserl. deutschen archaeologischen Instituts. Supplement IV.: Altertümer von Hierapolis. Herausgegeben von C. Humann, C. Cichorius, W. Judeich, F. Winter. 4to. xii, 202 pp., 61 engravings, 1 map. Berlin, Reimer. 24 Mk.

Jahreshefte des österreichischen archaeologischen Institutes in Wien. Vol. I. Part I. 4to. 142 pp., 88 columns, 63 engravings, and 3 plates. Vienna, Hölder. 15 Mk.

Journal international d'archéologie numismatique, dirigé par J. N. Svoronos. (In French, Greek and German.) Tome I. (4 parts.) Part I. 8vo. 120 pp., 8 plates, engravings. Athens, Barth. 16 Mk.

Julianus Apostata. Brambs (J. G.) Studien zu den Werken Julians des Apostaten. 8vo. 58 pp. Eichstätt.

Kaibel (Geo.) Die Prolegomena περὶ κομηθίας. 4to. 70 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 4 Mk. 50,
(Aus 'Abh. der philol.-histor. Klasse der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.')

Legrand (P. E.) Quo animo Gracci praesertim quinto et quarto saeculis tum in vita privata tum in publicis rebus divinationem adhibuerint. 8vo. 99 pp. Paris, Fontemoing.

Lineke (E.) P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus. 4to. 34 pp. Dresden.

Livius. Reinhold (G.) Das Geschichtswerk des Livius als Quelle späterer Historiker. 4to. 20 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Louvet (F.) Les jurisdictions criminelles à Rome sous la République. 8vo. 231 pp. Paris, Rousseau.

Lucrетius (Titus.) De rerum natura libri sex; revisione del testo, commento e studi introduttivi di C. Giussani. Vol. IV. (Libro V. VI.). 8vo. 319 pp. Turin, Loescher.

Martialis Epigrammaton libri, recogn. W. Gilbert. 12mo. xi, 408 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 70.

Mély (F. de.) Les Lapidaires de l'antiquité et du moyen age. Vol. II. fasc. 1 : Les Lapidaires grecs. Texte avec la collaboration de Ch. Ruelle. 4to. xvii, 226 pp. Paris, Leroux.

Menander. Geffcken (Johs.) Studien zu Menander. 4to. 20 pp. Hamburg. 2 Mk. 50.

Meyer (Willh.) Die Spaltung des Patriarchats Aquileja. 4to. 37 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 50.
(Aus 'Abh. der philol.-histor. Klasse der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften')

Mittheilungen (archaeologisch-epigraphische) aus Oesterreich-Ungarn. Herausgegeben von O. Bendendorf und E. Bormann. 20th year. 8vo. v, 246 pp., 7 plates, 57 engravings in text. Vienna, Hölder. 14 Mk.

Pindar. Bornemann (L.) Jahresbericht über Pindar 1892-96. (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte ver. class. Altertumswissenschaft.') 8vo. 28 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 1 Mk. 80.

Plato. Schaeffer (A.) Quaestiones Platonicae. 8vo. 71 pp. Argentorati. 2 Mk.

Plato. Susemihl (Frz.) Neue platonische Forschungen. Part I. 8vo. 56 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 20.

Pomponius Mela. Oertel (H.) Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Pomponius Mela. 8vo. 67 pp. Erlangen.

Prosopographia imperii romani saeculi primi, secundi et tertii. Pars III. Ediderunt P. de Rohden et H. Dessau. Royal 8vo. v, 502 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 25 Mk.

Reimregeln zur lateinischen Grammatik. Für den

Anfangsunterricht im Lateinischen zusammengestellt. 12mo. 7 pp. Meldorf, Hansen. 15 Pf.

Reinholt (H.) De graecitate patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti quæstiones grammaticæ. 8vo. 33 pp. Halle.

Schmid (Wilh.) Ueber den kulturgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang und die Bedeutung der griechischen Renaissance in der Römerzeit. 8vo. 48 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 Mk. 20.

Schulze (H. P.) Beiträge zur Erklärung der römischen Elegiker. II. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Schweizer (Ed.) Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften. Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der gemein-griechischen Sprache. 8vo. viii, 212 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 6 Mk.

Sophocles. Corssen (Pet.) *Die Antigone des Sophocles, ihre theatralische und sittliche Wirkung.* 8vo. 75 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 40.

Taciti (Cornelii) De origine, situ et moribus Germanorum. Ex codice Stuttgartensi ed. J. Hollub. Pars I. 8vo. 18 pp. Freivaldan. 50 Pf.

Tacitus. Thieme (O.) *De sententiis gravibus et amoenis, quae inscriptis Corn. Taciti passim reperiuntur.* I. *Annalium libri I.-XIV.* 4to. 30 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Tertullian. Kroymann (E.) *Die Tertullian-Ueberlieferung in Italien. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften.')* 8vo, 34 pp. Wien, Gerold. 80 Pf.

Thédenat (H.) Le Forum romain et les Forums impériaux. 16mo. xii, 406 pp., 2 folding plates, 46 engravings. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Theocritus. Legrand (P. E.) *Etude sur Théocrite.* 8vo. 450 pp. Paris, Fontemoing. (Bibliothèque des Écoles francaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 79.)

Theodorus. Grossschupf (F.) *De Theodori Prodromi in Rhodanthe elocutione.* 8vo. 58 pp. Leipzig.

Vergil. Jahn (P.) *Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theokrit. (Continuation.)* 4to. 25 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Victorius Vitensis. Ferrère (F.) *De Victorii Vitenis libro qui inscribitur Historia persecutionis Africanæ provinciarum historica et philologica commentatio.* 8vo. 157 pp. Paris, C. Klincksieck.

Weymann (C.) Jahresbericht über die christlich-lateinische Poesie von 1894-95 bis Ende 1897. (Aus 'Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Altertumswissenschaft.') 8vo. 55 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 2 Mk. 40.

Wiegand (L.) Studien zur staatsrechtlichen Stellung des Diktators Caesar: Das Recht über Krieg und Frieden. 4to. 25 pp. Dresden.

Wünsch (R.) Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom. 8vo, v, 123 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.

Xenophon. Karbe (H.) *Der Marsch der Zehntausend vom Zapates zum Phasis-Araxes (nach Xenophon's Anabasis III., 3, 6-IV., 6, 4. Historisch-geographisch erörtert).* 4to. 40 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.